

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 3, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we are ever grateful for Your unending mercies which sustain us day by day. We are thankful that You provide support when we feel weak, comfort when we face sorrow, and hope at times of difficulty. Help us to be aware of Your blessings, O Lord, that we will not take for granted the joys and opportunities that are ours, but rather live each day with a prayer to You in appreciation for all the gifts of life. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 283, nays 21, answered "present" 3, not voting 125, as follows:

(Roll No. 154)

YEAS—283

Ackerman	Bethune	Carr
Akaka	Billirakis	Chappell
Albosta	Bliley	Clarke
Alexander	Boehlert	Clinger
Anderson	Boggs	Coats
Andrews (NC)	Boland	Coleman (MO)
Andrews (TX)	Boner	Coleman (TX)
Annunzio	Bonior	Conable
Anthony	Borski	Cooper
Archer	Bosco	Courter
Aspin	Boucher	Coyne
Barnard	Boxer	Crane, Daniel
Barnes	Breaux	Crane, Philip
Bartlett	Britt	D'Amours
Bateman	Brooks	Daniel
Bates	Broomfield	Dannemeyer
Bedell	Broyhill	Daschle
Bellenson	Burton	Daub
Bennett	Campbell	Davis
Bereuter	Carper	de la Garza

DeWine	Latta
Dicks	Leath
Dingell	Lehman (CA)
Donnelly	Levin
Dowdy	Levitas
Downey	Lewis (CA)
Dreier	Livingston
Duncan	Loeffler
Dwyer	Long (LA)
Dyson	Long (MD)
Early	Lott
Eckart	Lowery (CA)
Edgar	Lowry (WA)
Edwards (AL)	Lujan
Edwards (CA)	Luken
Edwards (OK)	MacKay
English	Madigan
Erdreich	Markey
Erlenborn	Marriott
Evans (IL)	Martin (IL)
Fascell	Martin (NC)
Fazio	Matsui
Feighan	Mavroules
Ferraro	Mazzoli
Fiedler	McCandless
Fish	McCloskey
Flippo	McCurdy
Foley	McDade
Ford (TN)	McDonald
Frank	McEwen
Franklin	McHugh
Fuqua	McKernan
Gekas	McNulty
Gephardt	Michel
Gibbons	Mikulski
Gilman	Miller (CA)
Gingrich	Mineta
Gonzalez	Minish
Green	Moakley
Gregg	Mollinari
Guarini	Mollohan
Gunderson	Montgomery
Hall, Ralph	Moody
Hall, Sam	Moore
Hamilton	Moorhead
Hammerschmidt	Mrazek
Harrison	Murphy
Hatcher	Murtha
Hefner	Myers
Hertel	Natcher
Hillis	Nowak
Hopkins	O'Brien
Horton	Oakar
Howard	Obey
Hoyer	Olin
Hubbard	Ortiz
Hughes	Oxley
Hunter	Packard
Hyde	Parris
Jeffords	Patman
Jenkins	Patterson
Johnson	Paul
Jones (OK)	Pease
Kaptur	Penny
Kasich	Perkins
Kastenmeier	Petri
Kemp	Pickle
Kennelly	Porter
Kildee	Rahall
Kindness	Ratchford
Kogovsek	Ray
Kramer	Regula
LaFalce	Ridge
Lagomarsino	Rinaldo
Lantos	

NAYS—21

Brown (CO)	Goodling	Roberts
Coughlin	Hartnett	Roemer
Dorgan	Hiler	Schroeder
Durbin	Mack	Solomon
Emerson	McCollum	Stenholm
Evans (IA)	Miller (OH)	Walker
Gejdenson	Mitchell	Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Jacobs	Oberstar	Ottinger
--------	----------	----------

NOT VOTING—125

Addabbo	Gray	Owens
Applegate	Hall (IN)	Panetta
AuCoin	Hall (OH)	Pashayan
Badham	Hance	Pepper
Berman	Hansen (ID)	Price
Bevill	Hansen (UT)	Pritchard
Biaggi	Harkin	Pursell
Bonker	Hawkins	Quillen
Brown (CA)	Heftel	Rangel
Bryant	Hightower	Richardson
Byron	Holt	Rudd
Carney	Huckaby	Russo
Chandler	Hutto	Sabo
Chappie	Ireland	Schneider
Cheney	Jones (NC)	Shannon
Clay	Jones (TN)	Shaw
Coelho	Kazen	Shumway
Collins	Kolter	Shuster
Conte	Kostmayer	Sikorski
Conyers	Leach	Siljander
Corcoran	Lehman (FL)	Sisisky
Craig	Leland	Skelton
Crockett	Lent	Slattery
Dellums	Levine	Smith (FL)
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Denny
Dinkinson	Lipinski	St Germain
Dixon	Lloyd	Stratton
Dymally	Lundine	Torres
Fields	Lungren	Torricelli
Florio	Marlenee	Vander Jagt
Foglietta	Martin (NY)	Vucanovich
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Walgren
Forsythe	McCain	Weiss
Fowler	McGrath	Whitehurst
Frenzel	McKinney	Williams (MT)
Frost	Mica	Willson
Garcia	Morrison (CT)	Winn
Gaydos	Morrison (WA)	Wirth
Glickman	Neal	Wortley
Gore	Nelson	Young (AK)
Gradison	Nichols	Young (FL)
Gramm	Nielson	

□ 1010

Mrs. JOHNSON changed her vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1020

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week, particularly if there are any changes beyond what was announced yesterday.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the distinguished gentleman from Illinois would yield, the program for next week is as it was announced yesterday.

We will come in at noon on Monday and we will have seven suspensions. There are two additional suspensions that were not announced yesterday. They are H.R. 9, the Florida Wilder-ness, and H.R. 2477, the Alabama Wil-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

derness. Recorded votes on those suspensions will be postponed until the end of the day Monday.

After we have debated the suspensions, we plan to take up H.R. 3132, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act. We do not expect to be able to finish that on Monday and, therefore, would expect to finish it on Tuesday, after considering the Private Calendar.

Wednesday and the balance of the week we will meet at 10 o'clock and would plan to take up the State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriations, the Treasury-Postal appropriations, and Agriculture appropriations.

There will be votes expected next Friday, but we would adjourn by 3 o'clock, as we plan to do today. We plan to be finished by 3 o'clock today. We will continue on the legislative appropriations bill which was begun yesterday. It seems unlikely, there being some seven amendments pending at the desk by the latest count of which I was advised, that we would be able to finish it in time to take up the State Department authorization bill as we earlier had planned to do, assuming the completion of the legislative appropriation bill in a timely way. But unless that should happen earlier than I expect, we will not try to take up the State Department authorization today.

If good luck should prevail and we should conclude the legislative appropriation bill by noon or some such time, then we would go to the State Department authorization.

Mr. MICHEL. May I inquire of the gentleman on the votes on Monday? Will those suspension votes come at the end of the day, did I hear the gentleman say, or immediately after debating those suspensions?

Mr. WRIGHT. Suspension votes will be at the end of the day. That is in order to facilitate plans of Members who are having a difficult time getting back from far distances. We would hope that there might not be any immediate votes after our convening at 12 unless, perhaps, someone insists on a vote on approval of the Journal. There might conceivably be a vote on going into the Committee or something of that kind, but on substantive matters, until we get to the point of considering amendments to the energy and water appropriations bill, there would be no votes. It is impossible, of course, to determine how many such amendments there might be. But we will put the suspension votes off until after our consideration of the energy and water appropriations on that day and vote on them toward the end of the day on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1983

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KAPTUR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE VIRGINIA DAVIS PRICE OLIN

(Mr. OLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLIN. Madam Speaker, I hope you will show me a little forbearance here. My talk is short but important, and I will try to finish in the allotted time.

I rise today to pay tribute to a great lady. She was born in Baltimore, Md. and lived in Chicago and Kenilworth, Ill., Springfield, Ohio, and Boca Raton, Fla.

Her great uncle, Henry Gassaway Davis, was the first U.S. Senator from West Virginia. He lived in Elkins.

In 1916, as a student at Swarthmore College, this lady joined the women's suffrage movement and worked hard for that movement, and appeared in parades.

In 1924, in Kenilworth, she joined the League of Women Voters and became a leader in the league in Cook County, Ill.

All her life she has promoted good and effective government at all levels. She has worked to preserve our natural resources and she has worked hard to preserve the beauty in this country and she still does so today. She has all her life shown total respect for the dignity of all men and women, and she has worked for the rights of each individual to receive respect and equal opportunity.

Of all the values in her life, she has always put honesty and truthfulness first.

When speaking about spending money, she has always been tight as a tick. Life with her has never been easy but we always knew where we stood. Whenever we did anything bad, there was always the hairbrush to be applied to our backsides, and if we ever told a

lie, there was always a mouthful of soap to wash it out.

At age 86 she is currently on her way to attend her 65th college reunion at Swarthmore College.

My brother, Tom, who lives in Sierra Madre, Calif., and my sister, Andrea, who lives in Columbus, Ohio, join me in expressing to her how proud and grateful we all are, what she has done for us, how proud we are of the way she has led her life, and we hope that some of her fine qualities might have rubbed off on us.

I am talking about my mother, Katherine Virginia Davis Price Olin, a great lady.

EL SALVADOR LIKE VIETNAM

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, would it not be nice if the State Department, with its words, would say that the situation in El Salvador is developing pretty much the same as did the situation in Vietnam, and with its actions, would say that it is not, rather than the other way around.

My father says there are too many people making history who have never studied history.

□ 1030

IS WAR HERO, M. SGT. ROY P. BENAVIDEZ, TO BE DENIED DISABILITY BENEFITS?

(Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, today, all of us should be aware of the sad plight of M. Sgt. Roy P. Benavidez, who has been denied his social security disability benefits.

Allow me to briefly state some facts in this case: Benavidez, a former Green Beret, credited with saving the lives of at least eight other Green Berets after he sustained severe wounds in the abdomen, back, thigh, head, and arms and being clubbed by an enemy soldier; unable to bend, lift heavy objects or stand for a long period; awarded the Medal of Honor by President Reagan in February 1981.

I ask my colleagues: Is this the way to treat a disabled war hero? If it were not for brave people like Sgt. Roy Benavidez, would we have the freedoms that we enjoy today? What lessons are his children learning about our democracy from this heartless action? How many other veterans are caught in a similar situation but have not received the publicity Sergeant Benavidez has in order to fight this cruel ruling? Finally, Sergeant Benavidez was there

when his country needed him. Where are we now that he needs us?

ADMINISTRATION SHOWS CALLOUS DISREGARD IN BENAVIDEZ CASE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Madam Speaker, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, Sergeant Roy Benavidez is, indeed, a victim of this administration's callous disregard for human dignity.

His being removed from the social security disability rolls makes him just one of 300,000 who have been thrown into the cold under the guise of fiscal responsibility. The difference is that Sergeant Benavidez is a Medal of Honor recipient. The President, in fact, pinned it on him personally.

The House Aging Committee, on which I serve, has just concluded the second in its series of field hearings into these arbitrary and unfair cutbacks. Our findings are staggering. One woman told of her husband who terminated from disability, suffered three heart attacks. His fourth was fatal.

The White House has placed the blame on Congress for the fate of Sergeant Benavidez. Another administration official says the President has taken a personal interest in the war hero's case.

Will the President also take a personal interest in the plight of the many thousands who suffer pain and anguish, much like Sergeant Benavidez?

Sergeant Benavidez saved American lives from the hostile government in Vietnam. Through public awareness of his misfortune, he may again save more American lives—but this time from his own Government.

OFFERING OF JOBS AMENDMENT THWARTED IN YESTERDAY'S ACTION

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, we received some good news on the unemployment front this morning. The number of unemployed Americans dropped again last month. The number is still far too high, but it is getting better.

Why does the figure remain as high as it is? One reason is that there are particular groups of Americans with horrendously high unemployment in their ranks. The unemployment rate among minority youth is nearly 50 percent, and among minority males it

went up 5 points last month when overall unemployment was dropping.

Yet yesterday this House voted not to discuss an amendment designed to help that very group of Americans. I was prepared to offer an amendment yesterday that would permit the Secretary of Housing to have regulatory discretion to give more minority young people jobs, real jobs, and yet this House voted not to even consider that amendment.

Who really wants to help the unemployed? Who has real compassion for those who suffer the most? Look at yesterday's vote on allowing the committee to rise rather than consider a jobs amendment. Those who voted yes on that motion were voting for more unemployment.

A NEW DEPARTMENT OF TRADE

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Madam Speaker, I am delighted and was happy to see that Secretary Baldrige and our Secretary of Trade, Bill Brock, have agreed that we do need a Department of Trade. This Department of Trade will be in lieu of our Commerce Department and will coordinate all of our trade objectives. As our markets are becoming more and more internationalized, I think we can all see the need for this Department.

Senator ROTH in the other body and our colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BONKER) have introduced legislation to help promote and establish this department.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we all will have a chance to study the legislation and to cosponsor the legislation. I think it is going to be one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress will consider in this session.

Trade will be an issue of more and more significance to the United States and all nations. Jobs, our standard of living, our economic well-being are all going to resolve more and more around trade.

THE WILLIAMSBURG SUMMIT

(Without objection, Mr. MICHEL was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post reports that our colleague, Mr. COELHO, has charged that everything in the recent Williamsburg summit was directed toward public relations.

The Post reported that Mr. COELHO said "ruefully" that "a President dominates the news." Let me say the leaders of the Western World do not agree with the gentleman's assessment that this was a PR affair.

The Post further reported that Mr. COELHO said his party is compromising with the President in foreign affairs because such compromise "destroys" foreign affairs as "an issue—that may not be a bad strategy."

Mr. Speaker, rarely do I comment on the internal affairs of the other party, but I feel that I have no choice.

If Mr. COELHO indeed speaks for his party as Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, I must say he does a disservice to the many patriotic Democrats who support the President's foreign and defense policies.

They do not do so for political gain. They do not do so as part of a campaign strategy. They do so out of love for their country and of sincere commitment to the principles of strong defense.

Mr. Speaker, I commend those gentlemen and ladies who are supporting the President when they feel inclined to do so.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. BROWN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this morning we will be considering seven amendments to the legislative appropriations bill. They are moderate amendments. None is draconian.

They are meant to address the serious problem of the deficit, and they speak in words louder than just the amount they save this Government and the taxpayers of our country. They set an example for our country. They tell the citizens of this Nation that we in the House are willing to address our own problems, to eliminate our own waste, and to address our own abuses.

With several exceptions, these amendments provide for 5-percent increases over last year. The goal that the committee announced in its report was for the same level of increase. The amendments are meant to provide increases in our expenses but only moderate ones.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the Members in the Chamber will take the time to examine those amendments because they are meant as a positive input for the legislative process.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3135)

making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 301, nays 10, answered "present" 1, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—301

Ackerman	DeWine	Hunter
Akaka	Dicks	Hyde
Albosta	Dingell	Jacobs
Alexander	Donnelly	Jeffords
Anderson	Dowdy	Jenkins
Andrews (NC)	Dreier	Johnson
Andrews (TX)	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Annuzio	Durbin	Jones (OK)
Anthony	Dwyer	Kaptur
Applegate	Dyson	Kasich
Archer	Early	Kastenmeier
Aspin	Eckart	Kemp
Barnard	Edgar	Kennelly
Barnes	Edwards (CA)	Kildee
Bartlett	Edwards (OK)	Kindness
Bateman	English	Kogovsek
Bates	Erdreich	Kramer
Bedell	Erlenborn	LaFalce
Beilenson	Evans (IA)	Lagomarsino
Bennett	Evans (IL)	Lantos
Bereuter	Fascell	Latta
Bethune	Fazio	Leath
Bilirakis	Feighan	Lehman (CA)
Billiey	Ferraro	Leland
Boehlert	Fiedler	Levin
Boggs	Fish	Levitas
Boland	Flippo	Lewis (CA)
Boner	Foley	Livingston
Bonior	Ford (MI)	Loeffler
Borski	Ford (TN)	Long (LA)
Boucher	Frank	Long (MD)
Boxer	Franklin	Lott
Breaux	Fuqua	Lowery (CA)
Britt	Gejdenson	Lowry (WA)
Brooks	Gekas	Lukens
Broomfield	Gephardt	Lundine
Brown (CO)	Gibbons	Lungren
Broyhill	Gilman	Mack
Burton	Gingrich	MacKay
Byron	Gonzalez	Madigan
Campbell	Goodling	Marriott
Carper	Gray	Martin (IL)
Carr	Green	Martin (NC)
Chappell	Guarini	Matsui
Clarke	Gunderson	Mavroules
Clinger	Hall, Ralph	Mazzoli
Coleman (MO)	Hall, Sam	McCandless
Coleman (TX)	Hamilton	McCloskey
Conable	Hammerschmidt	McCollum
Cooper	Harrison	McCurdy
Coughlin	Hatcher	McDade
Courter	Hefner	McEwen
Coyne	Hertel	McHugh
Crane, Daniel	Hiler	McKernan
Crane, Phillip	Hillis	McNulty
D'Amours	Hopkins	Michel
Dannemeyer	Horton	Mikulski
Daschle	Howard	Miller (CA)
Daub	Hoyer	Miller (OH)
Davis	Hubbard	Mineta
de la Garza	Hughes	Minish

Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Rahall
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Ridge
Rinaldo

Coats
Dorgan
Emerson
Gregg

Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Simon
Skeen
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump

Hartnett
Lujan
McDonald
Ritter

Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauszin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Wheat
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (OH)
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zschau

Sensenbrenner
Solomon

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ottinger

NOT VOTING—120

Addabbo	Gore	Owens
AuCoin	Gradison	Panetta
Badham	Gramm	Pashayan
Berman	Hall (IN)	Pepper
Beverly	Hall (OH)	Price
Blaggi	Hance	Pritchard
Bonker	Hansen (ID)	Pursell
Bosco	Hansen (UT)	Quillen
Brown (CA)	Harkin	Rangel
Bryant	Hawkins	Richardson
Carney	Hefelt	Russo
Chandler	Hightower	Sabo
Chappelle	Holt	Schneider
Cheney	Huckaby	Shannon
Clay	Hutto	Shaw
Coelho	Ireland	Shumway
Collins	Jones (TN)	Shuster
Conte	Kazen	Sikorski
Conyers	Kolter	Siljander
Corcoran	Kostmayer	Sisisky
Craig	Leach	Skelton
Crockett	Lehman (FL)	Slattery
Daniel	Lent	Smith (FL)
Dellums	Levine	Smith, Denny
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Dickinson	Lipinski	St Germain
Dixon	Lloyd	Stratton
Downey	Markey	Torres
Dymally	Marlenee	Torricelli
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NY)	Vander Jagt
Fields	Martinez	Vandergriff
Florio	McCain	Vucanovich
Foglietta	McGrath	Weiss
Forsythe	McKinney	Whitehurst
Mica	Morrison (CT)	Williams (MT)
Frenzel	Morrison (WA)	Wilson
Frost	Nelson	Winn
Garcia	Nichols	Wirth
Gaydos	Nielson	Wortley
Glickman		Young (AK)

□ 1050

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3135, with Mr. DE LA GARZA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, June 2, the remainder of the bill beginning on page 3, line 19, had been considered as having been read and open to amendment at any point. Are there any amendments in order under clause 2(c), rule XXI?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

For salaries and expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, \$44,000,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 3135 offered by Mr. GREGG: On page 5, line 17, strike out "\$44,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,600,000".

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to address the issue of special and select committee funding.

Under the language of the bill as it is presently drafted there is \$44 million planned for select and special committee funding. Now, as I read the activities of select and special committees the total funding last year for select and special committees spent was only \$2.7 million. This represents under the language of this bill as it is presently drafted, if I am correct, a 2,000 percent increase, because there is no representation that anything other than special and select committees are covered by this language.

Now, it is possible that the bill is inaccurate; that there is supposed to be included in here some other form of funding that this \$44 million is going to be spent on, but with all the money we spend on staff around here I cannot believe that that would be the case. So, I am assuming that actually this bill is calling for \$44 million for special and select committees, which is a \$41 million increase in the funding for those committees.

Now, I could be wrong and I would certainly be willing to withdraw this amendment if that is an incorrect statement.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think if the gentleman would turn in the report accompanying the bill, to page 13, he will find a list of the committees that are being funded under this category that are funded at levels authorized in House Resolution 127 of March 22 of this year; and if he will read through the list of committees that have amounts authorized he will come to a figure of some \$43.2 million, almost \$44 million.

So, the gentleman's amendment which reduces it, I want to underscore this, to \$2.6 million, would severely reduce the ability of all of the committees of the House, not just select committees, to do their job. And I think the gentleman probably does not intend for that to occur.

If I may go on for a second, the increase that we provide for here in fiscal year 1984 is really only 1.6 percent more than was authorized for this calendar prior year.

So, I would think that, one, we are being very responsible, in keeping almost a steady state budget for this category, but second, this funding goes to far more basic activities than simply the staffing of select committees.

□ 1100

Mr. GREGG. Well, is the gentleman representing that special is a euphemism for standing?

Mr. FAZIO. This account funds all the standing committees, as well as the special and select committees. The funding for the standing committees takes care of their investigation funds over and above those statutory employees provided by rule XI of the House.

Mr. GREGG. Special, by definition, means unusual, extraordinary, exceptional; standing means typical, ordinary and consistent. Now it would seem to me that maybe we should amend this language to include the term standing in order that it be clear that what we are appropriating for is the standing committees and not the special and select committees, which I think by definition are different committees.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification of this point. I am sure that Members are far better informed than they were before this amendment was offered. And I also appreciate the gentleman's willingness to withdraw it, if the gentleman feels we have accomplished our purpose in informing the Members as to the details of this particular account.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman raises a good point. This title at best, is misleading in describing this section of the bill and the purpose we are about here. It might well be that if the gentleman would consider withdrawing his amendment, that in technical corrections of the bill we might change that title to make it clearer than it is. If the gentleman does raise the question, the public could also be in doubt.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I would have no problem with better informing the public as to what we are funding here.

Mr. GREGG. That would be fine with me if we would change the language so this section becomes, Standing, Special and Select Committees, so that it becomes clear that what we are doing here is funding \$44 million for all the committees of the House and not just for the special and select committees of the House, that would be, I think, much more appropriate, obviously, because \$44 million to be spent on those minor committees would be excessive.

More importantly than that, I think it points out, from my concern, the rather considerable amount of money therefor that is being spent on standing committees, if standing committees is identified in this language.

If the chairman would agree to an amendment of this—

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman would yield further, my concern is only this: I do not understand the full ramifications of changing the title. I think we would have to look at the rules of the House, and the precedents that we are dealing with here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FAZIO. I cannot readily indicate to the gentleman what implications a technical amendment might have. I certainly support the clarification. I have no problem with it and would like to indicate to the gentleman that at some point in the future I would be very much willing to make the change that he is asking for. I am reluctant to simply agree to an amendment at this point without knowing the full ramifications of this in the sense that we are dealing in an area of the law that is based on the rules of the House and on historic precedent that may actually lead us in some other direction that neither he nor I could foresee at this time.

I do commit to the gentleman that I would like to explore this further and if we can change the title in future

legislation, I certainly would support the gentleman's efforts.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to make the point the gentleman from California, chairman of the subcommittee has just made. We use various archaic terms in our House language. We call the assistant majority leader and minority leader whips, for instance, and it may be that within the House language that "special" would require some real change so that the historic background of special committees would be able to be on the record. Perhaps we could be able to satisfy both situations by saying, "Special (Standing) Committees."

Mr. GREGG. As long as it is clear that this is a standing committee allocation, which I believe is the point I wanted to raise, because "special" I believe is a different kind of committee than a "standing" committee, by definition.

Therefore, clearly this is a standing committee allocation.

I will accept the chairman's representations and be happy to work with him so that we can get more clarification in the language of the bill, because quite honestly I believe that this bill passed in its present form you could be subject to some sort of injunctive relief, or at least any injunctive action, to the effect that you simply have not funded your standing committees in this House, but independent of that, I will be happy to amend my amendment so that it now reads that on page 5, line 17, strike out "\$44 million" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38 million," if the chairman would agree to allow me to make that amendment by unanimous consent so that I can address the funding of standing committees within this bill.

Mr. FAZIO. Well, I would have to reserve the right to object to that. I do not believe that really was the original intent of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Yes; it is, if I may reclaim my time, because what I am trying to do here is address this figure of \$44 million. Now if it were just special and select committees—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, if the language were special and select, then the committee funding we would be talking about is in the range of \$2.7 million, that is what is spent on special and select committees in this House.

However, if the language is "special, standing and select," whatever the chairman works out to adequately reflect that, then this language of \$44 million, rather than reducing it to \$2.6 million to cover special and select, should be reduced, in my opinion, to cover special, select, and standing committees, and the proper figure, in my opinion, would be \$38 million, in that area, which would get us back to the 1983 levels prior to the supplemental going through, prior to the 12 percent, which is the amendment that I would like to direct toward the standing committee funding levels.

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman obviously has two purposes with his amendment. And should he seek unanimous consent to make that change, I certainly would not object, but I think there clearly is a separate purpose in this amendment that the gentleman is now attempting to offer.

Mr. GREGG. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. What I am trying to do with this amendment is address standing committees. Prior to that I was trying to address this section as I read it, which was just limited to select and special committees.

If the chairman follows the logic and I hope I am being clear enough, under the prior language where standing committees were not considered in this section, \$44 million was clearly inappropriate. It should have been \$2.7 million, \$2.6 million. Under the language, if we assume that this is going to be standing committees funding levels, then we should also take a look at standing committees. In my opinion, the standing committee funding level of \$44 million is far too high and should be reduced, when we are talking about investigatory staff.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change my amendment from a reduction to \$2.6 million to a reduction to \$38 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is so modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG: On page 5, line 17, strike out "44,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "38,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, if we accept the fact that this section addresses standing committees and that the \$44 million addressed here is addressed to standing and select committees—which I do not think the language reads that way now but we are going to change it so hopefully it

will—then we are looking at a significant funding increase over what we originally authorized in 1983 and what we specifically spent in 1982.

We are looking at a 12-percent increase over the 1982 actual spending and we are looking to an 8.4-percent increase over 1982 authorized funds and 1983 authorized funds prior to the supplemental. That is a considerable increase.

Therefore, it seems to me, that by a reduction back to the 1982 levels of actual expenditures, we would be reflecting, in my opinion, a much more sincere attempt to bring under control the cost of this House in what has been one of the most explosive areas of expenditures, that specifically is the area of investigative staff. In fact, if we look at the history of investigative staff over the last 10 years, we will see that we are looking at a 300- to 400-percent increase in the cost of investigative staffs of this House over the last 10 years.

□ 1110

We are seeing a 300- to 400-percent increase in the numbers of investigative staffs. There are committees in this House who have gone from the numbers in the low teens in the early 1970's into the hundreds in staff members in the 1980's without any significant increase in the workload of those committees and, in fact, some of those committees have seen a reduction in their workload.

It would seem to me that if you were going to take the point on the issue of bringing under control our high deficits, that we as a Congress ought to at least be willing to do some level funding in the area of our committee staffs, not expand the dollars being spent on them over the next year, over the coming year.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman says, incidentally, is absolutely correct. The gentleman is totally right on his figures.

The Congress of the 1980's is substantially different from the Congress of the early 1970's. In the early 1970's the committee chairmen were barons and kings, and the committees were their fiefdoms. As a result of the reforms made in the mid-1970's, the subcommittees assumed greater and great responsibilities. As a result of that activity and the division of authority and the increasing assertiveness on the part of the subcommittees and the Members, it was necessary, in my judgment, that those subcommittees be funded.

Incidentally, as the gentleman knows, I am on the Appropriations

Committee, and I am not on any of the legislative committees. I have never personally benefited from any of these changes, but I want to tell the gentleman that I totally supported the division of authority within the committees in the granting to the subcommittees of greater authority. As a result of that, there was a necessity, a corollary, for greater funding for the subcommittees and for their investigative staffs, which were nonexistent prior to that time.

So what the gentleman calls an explosive development is correct. But there was a reason for it, not simply bureaucracy, but because of the decisions that were conscientiously made by this body to diffuse some of the power barons that had developed in the Congress over the years. I think that was the right decision and the correct one. I know the gentleman does not want to go back to the old ways.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, accepting that argument, which I may or may not accept—I was not here then, and I presume that there was also the necessity to research legislation during the early 1970's, as there is now—accepting that argument, what I am saying is that we are not continuing that transition. We have gone through that transition. We are at a level where we are seeing huge staffs on all major committees in this House and staffs which clearly should be able to handle the workloads.

In fact, when you look at a comparison between the minority staff and the majority staff on most of these committees, and you expect the minority to handle their staff, for example, on Commerce and Energy, with 20 or so members, and the majority has 150 members on its staff, you have to assume that the staff work can be done with the staff that is allocated because, clearly, with those ratios, at least one side is getting their work done with a small number of staff people.

So it seems to me that we ought to be able to at least level fund our staffing commitments in this House over the next year as we confront a \$200 billion deficit, if we are going to ask other levels of the Government to reduce or level fund themselves. Why should we not take the initiative? What I am saying is that we should present an example here by level funding our situation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have great difficulty with the gentleman's amendment, but not in terms of the desirability of cutting back some of our committees. It is clear that some of our committees have exploded in terms of their numbers. We ought to be able to do something about that. Unfortunately, I find myself in a very frustrating position. As the gentleman knows, earlier this year the leadership which controls the House made a decision to change the rules, and this particular rule change that affects this bill does not allow us to specifically rifle at an individual committee. If we cut across the board, unfortunately we may find ourselves in the position where the Energy Committee of which the gentleman talks is not the one that is cut but, rather, a committee that we think is understaffed. Because of that, it is difficult to just lightly accept an across-the-board cut. Frankly, it seems to me that the job we have to do is to change those rules that forget about rifling at individual committees making changes where it is appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I would like to quickly respond that we went over this issue yesterday, of course, which is whether or not we should abate our efforts to try to bring under control spending at the committee levels because of the fact that we can no longer rifle our actual activities and reductions. And, yes, it is an impediment to our efforts. But if we accept that as a total impediment, then we are never going to get any control over our spending because we will never be able to make any significant changes in these appropriation bills as they come out of the subcommittee. Therefore, I think we have to make the tough decision that we are going to make the across-the-board cut and send it back to the various committees and hope that it is done fairly.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we heard a good deal yesterday and we obviously will hear a good deal more today about the need to take the initiative here in the legislative branch and to show the way toward reductions in the budget.

I think the Members need to hear perhaps, one more time that we are doing that in the legislative branch.

This is not a profligate spending bill. We are making progress, and we have made progress, in the very areas that the gentleman from New Hampshire is talking about. Specifically, let us look at the legislative branch versus the ex-

ecutive branch in terms of funding right now. This is virtually the same budget we had last year. The increase over the current fiscal year 1983 level is only three-tenths of 1 percent in this bill. And this is not the first time that that has occurred, Mr. Chairman. Since 1979 the legislative branch appropriation has grown at an annual rate of 5.3 percent while the Federal Government has grown at an 11.6-percent rate, and all during the time when the annual inflation rate has been around 8 percent on the average.

In effect, the Federal budget has been growing at a rate over twice as fast as the legislative branch budget. In the meantime, it could be said very fairly that we have had a real dollar decline in the legislative branch budget. But specifically as it relates to special and select committees and, as the gentleman has so aptly pointed out, which includes the investigative funds for the standing committees, we have in this bill only a 1.6-percent increase over the amount authorized for calendar 1983.

As I have indicated, the staff of the legislative branch has been declining. We have had an absolute reduction for the last 2 years in the number of people employed in the legislative branch. And as it relates to committee staff, we have had a reduction of 143 people since 1980. We essentially have had level staffing since 1978. And that is, by the way, with the addition of the new Select Committee on Families, Children and Youth. So we are making progress. We are doing more with the same number of people, or less.

I think we are setting the example that the gentleman wants us to set. If we were to accept his amendment, we would be cutting into the core of the staffing of the very important standing committees and the very significant select committees that the Members of this House have decided on more than one occasion are important and necessary to the conduct of our business.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we are doing what the gentleman is asking. I think we have done it year after year. I ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREGG) there were—ayes 17, noes 18.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 189, not voting 110, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—133

Andrews (TX)	Gregg	Packard
Applegate	Gunderson	Patman
Archer	Hall, Ralph	Patterson
Bartlett	Hall, Sam	Paul
Bateman	Hammerschmidt	Petri
Bennett	Hansen (ID)	Regula
Bereuter	Hartnett	Ridge
Bethune	Hiler	Ritter
Billirakis	Hillis	Roberts
Billiey	Hopkins	Robinson
Boehlert	Hubbard	Roemer
Breaux	Hunter	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Hyde	Roth
Broyhill	Jacobs	Roukema
Burton	Johnson	Rudd
Campbell	Kasich	Schaefer
Carper	Kemp	Schulze
Clinger	Kindness	Sensenbrenner
Coats	Kramer	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Lagomarsino	Smith (NE)
Conable	Latta	Smith, Robert
Coughlin	Leath	Snowe
Courter	Livingston	Solomon
Crane, Daniel	Loeffler	Stenholm
Crane, Philip	Lott	Stump
Daniel	Lowery (CA)	Sundquist
Dannemeyer	Lujan	Tauke
Daub	Lungren	Tauzin
DeWine	Mack	Taylor
Dreier	Madigan	Thomas (CA)
Duncan	Martin (IL)	Valentine
Early	Martin (NC)	Vander Jagt
Eckart	McCandless	Volkmer
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Walgren
Emerson	McDonald	Walker
Erdreich	McEwen	Weber
Erlenborn	McKernan	Whittaker
Evans (IA)	Michel	Williams (OH)
Fiedler	Miller (OH)	Winn
Fish	Molinar	Wolf
Franklin	Moore	Wyllie
Gekas	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Gibbons	O'Brien	Zschau
Gingrich	Olin	
Goodling	Oxley	

NOES—189

Ackerman	Dyson	Levitas
Akaka	Edgar	Lewis (CA)
Albosta	Edwards (CA)	Long (LA)
Alexander	English	Long (MD)
Anderson	Evans (IL)	Lowry (WA)
Andrews (NC)	Fascell	Luken
Annuizio	Fazio	Lundine
Anthony	Feighan	MacKay
Aspin	Ferraro	Markey
Barnard	Flippo	Marriott
Barnes	Foley	Matsui
Bates	Ford (MI)	Mavroules
Bedell	Ford (TN)	Mazzoli
Beilenson	Frank	McCloskey
Boggs	Fuqua	McCurdy
Boland	Gejdenson	McDade
Boner	Gephardt	McHugh
Bonior	Gilman	McNulty
Borski	Gonzalez	Mikulski
Bosco	Gray	Miller (CA)
Boucher	Green	Mineta
Boxer	Guarini	Minish
Britt	Hamilton	Mitchell
Brooks	Harrison	Moakley
Broomfield	Hatcher	Mollohan
Byron	Hefner	Montgomery
Carr	Hertel	Moody
Chappell	Horton	Mrazek
Clarke	Howard	Murphy
Coleman (TX)	Hoyer	Murtha
Cooper	Hughes	Myers
Coyne	Jeffords	Natcher
D'Amours	Jenkins	Neal
Daschle	Jones (NC)	Nowak
Davis	Jones (OK)	Oakar
de la Garza	Kaptur	Oberstar
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Obey
Dicks	Kennelly	Ortiz
Dingell	Kildee	Ottlinger
Donnelly	Kogovsek	Owens
Dorgan	LaFalce	Parris
Dowdy	Lantos	Pease
Downey	Lehman (CA)	Penny
Durbin	Leland	Perkins
Dwyer	Levin	Pickle

Porter	Sharp	Traxler
Rahall	Shelby	Udall
Ratchford	Simon	Vandergriff
Ray	Smith (IA)	Vento
Reid	Smith (NJ)	Watkins
Rinaldo	Snyder	Waxman
Rodino	Solarz	Weaver
Roe	Spratt	Wheat
Rose	Staggers	Whitley
Rostenkowski	Stangeland	Whitten
Rowland	Stark	Wise
Roybal	Stokes	Wolpe
Savage	Studds	Wright
Sawyer	Swift	Wyden
Scheuer	Synar	Yates
Schroeder	Tallon	Yatron
Schumer	Thomas (GA)	Young (MO)
Seiberling	Towns	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—110

Addabbo	Gradison	Panetta
AuCoin	Gramm	Pashayan
Badham	Hall (IN)	Pepper
Berman	Hall (OH)	Price
Bevill	Hance	Pritchard
Biaggi	Hansen (UT)	Pursell
Bonker	Harkin	Quillen
Brown (CA)	Hawkins	Rangel
Bryant	Heftel	Richardson
Carney	Hightower	Russo
Chandler	Holt	Sabo
Chappie	Huckaby	Schneider
Cheney	Hutto	Shannon
Clay	Ireland	Shaw
Coelho	Jones (TN)	Shumway
Collins	Kazen	Shuster
Conte	Kolter	Sikorski
Conyers	Kostmayer	Siljander
Corcoran	Leach	Sisisky
Craig	Lehman (FL)	Skelton
Crockett	Lent	Slatery
Derrick	Levine	Smith (FL)
Dickinson	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Denny
Dixon	Lipinski	Spence
Dymally	Lloyd	St Germain
Edwards (AL)	Marlenee	Stratton
Felds	Martin (NY)	Torres
Florio	Martinez	Torricelli
Foglietta	McCain	Vucanovich
Forsythe	McGrath	Weiss
Fowler	McKinney	Whitehurst
Frenzel	Mica	Williams (MT)
Frost	Morrison (CT)	Wilson
Garcia	Morrison (WA)	Wirth
Gaydos	Nelson	Wortley
Glickman	Nichols	Young (AK)
Gore	Nielson	

□ 1130

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Shaw for, with Mr. Hall of Ohio against.

Mr. Wortley for, with Mr. Pepper against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Dixon against.

Mr. Gramm for, with Mr. Dymally against.

Mr. Badham for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Mr. Pashayan for, with Mr. Garcia against.

Mr. Chappie for, with Mr. Nelson of Florida against.

Mr. Siljander for, with Mr. Bonker against.

Mr. Denny Smith for, with Mr. Smith of Florida against.

Mr. Lewis of Florida for, with Mr. Sisisky against.

Mr. Corcoran for, with Mr. Lehman of Florida against.

Mr. Cheney for, with Mr. Florio against.

Mr. Pursell for, with Mr. Morrison of Connecticut against.

Mr. Craig for, with Mr. Crockett against.

Mr. McCain for, with Mrs. Collins against.

Mr. DAVIS and Mr. AKAKA changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KINDNESS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in looking over the report language of this bill, I notice that it will cost about \$384 million to operate the House of Representatives for fiscal year 1984. That appears on page 9 of the report. On page 10 of the report appears an item on which I would like to ask the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) to give me some assistance.

It states that the LBJ intern program and former Speaker's staff will cost \$847,000 for fiscal year 1984.

Can the gentleman from California tell me how much money will be spent in fiscal year 1984 for the funding of the operation of the staff of the former Speaker, the Honorable Carl Albert of Oklahoma?

□ 1140

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman from Texas will give us a second, I will get that figure for him. If the gentleman will yield, it is a portion of the \$847,000.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I will yield to the gentleman. It states that the LBJ intern program and the former Speakers' staff will cost \$847,000. My question is: Of the \$847,000, how much of that is devoted to or is earmarked for the former Speakers' staff?

Mr. FAZIO. We are researching the question right now, if the gentleman will give us a second. This question did come before the subcommittee and at that time I remember responding by indicating that the majority of the funding is for the LBJ program.

The former Speakers' program is \$64,000 of the total of \$847,000 in the bill for those two items.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. The \$64,000 is for the former Speakers' staff?

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE
ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$103,242,000, including: Official Expenses of Members, \$67,200,000; supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$9,208,000; furniture and furnishings, \$985,000; stenographic reporting of committee hearings; \$700,000; reemployed annu-

itants reimbursement, \$2,300,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement fund, and health benefits fund, \$22,349,000; and miscellaneous items including, but not limited to, purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$500,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 4, line 22, strike out, "\$103,242,000" and insert "\$96,268,550".

On line 23 strike out "\$67,200,000" and insert "\$60,226,550".

Mr. BARTLETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Chairman, because this is an amendment that I believe that the House will want to pay careful attention to. I would tell the House what this amendment does is in the area of official expenses increases over last year.

This gentleman's amendment does not decrease funding; it increases funding by 5 percent and adds back the total amount of the supplemental for 1983. So this amendment would add to the fiscal year 1983 regular appropriation an additional 5 percent, and then add on 100 percent of the supplemental appropriation.

This would be in contrast with the committee version which would have added on 19 percent to last year's regular appropriation and added the supplemental appropriation on top of that. The difference, Mr. Chairman, is a difference between a 16-percent increase for official expenses in a year in which inflation is running at the 5-percent level or a 4.3-percent increase for official expenses in the same year.

In short, the committee version would spend \$67,200,000 for official expenses, is up from \$57 million in total, including supplementals, up almost \$10 million from the total that was spent in 1983 to \$67 million or a 16-percent increase.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is a reasonable amendment. It is an amendment that would introduce some reasonable rate of growth into official expenses instead of the unreasonable and much overblown rate of growth of a 16-percent increase in 1 year.

I would further note, Mr. Chairman, that much of the inflation costs that have been built into the cost of these official expense—travel, typing, printing, rent, telephone expenses—have already been accounted for because, Mr. Chairman, since 1979 the increase for official expenses has been from \$39

million in 1979 to now it would be almost double if we were to accept the committee recommendation.

There has been large inflation years in these items. But, Mr. Chairman, the big inflation increases are behind us and now we should take that into account.

I am not asking the committee to decrease funding. I am simply asking to control the growth of funding and to control the growth in these items.

I have agreed to add on the supplemental so the full total supplemental from last year is included.

I would simply read in support of the amendment from the committee report itself. The committee report states in the highlights of the bill, and this is the summary, I suppose, of the entire appropriation bill: "Generally, the bill allows for an inflation rate of 5 percent over the 1983 levels."

Generally, the bill allows for an inflation rate of 5 percent over 1983 levels. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that that "generally" ought to apply to the specific of official expenses from Members. We are asking the rest of the Government, indeed the rest of the Congress, to control the rate of growth of the Federal Government. We are asking the taxpayers to control the rate of growth, and this Congress, with official expenses, ought to control the growth of official expenses to 5 percent from one year to the next.

This is a very clear amendment and very straightforward. If you are in favor of a 16-percent increase from one year to the next in official expenses you should vote against the amendment. If you are in favor of a 5-percent increase for official expenses from one year to the next, you should vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the language included in H.R. 3135, the legislative appropriations bill, freezing the pay for Members of Congress.

When this issue was considered last December I strongly opposed and voted against lifting the pay freeze for Members of Congress. This is not the time for pay raises when over 10 percent of the American people are out of work and this country is in a prolonged economic recession. We must set an example by not raising congressional pay but instead working for effective bipartisan solutions to our Nation's problems.

In my own State of Michigan there are over 650,000 people out of work. Economic recovery is and must remain our No. 1 priority. My record in oppo-

sition to congressional pay raises is clear and I am glad to have this opportunity to again speak out on the floor of the House of Representatives against any pay raise for Members of Congress. I support the provision in H.R. 3135 freezing congressional pay and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the reason I oppose this is that we are essentially funding this account at a much lower rate, than the figure that has been authorized by the House Administration Committee under 2 U.S.C. 57, the law that is the primary authority for that committee administer those expenses. We are, and I want to underscore this, \$17 million below the figure that the House Administration Committee has authorized for Members' allowances for their official expenses.

We have taken a very realistic view of what Members are likely to spend. And we are aware that each year many Members spend far less than they are allotted. We encourage that and we assume that will occur once again in fiscal year 1984. That is why we do not full fund these allowances in the bill.

There is no question that each individual Member must then be responsible for making the kinds of reductions in their own individual accounts that would be responsible and show our constituents that we are careful with these funds. There is no question, at the same time, that we all have different situations.

For example, if you look at some of the documentation that led the House Administration Committee to provide for an increase in the authorized amount you will note increases, in travel costs of some 15 percent. You will note increases in the cost of equipment and stationery equipment and other things that are beyond the average rate of inflation.

But I want to reiterate we have not gone along with the House Administration Committee authorized figure. We simply do not plug in a figure here. We are \$17 million below it.

A further reduction would impair the ability that each one of us must have to serve our constituents and conduct our official business. If we do not need it, then we do not need to spend it.

I think it is important that the Members understand that they are the chief governor on the expenditure of their own accounts. They should take action individually. But if we were to take action here, as this amendment would, across the board, what we would be doing, aside from gutting the appropriations process, making it really irrelevant, would be to force some Members to take greater reductions than others based on the rate by which they spend money.

In effect we would be forcing some Members to spend money quicker so they could get a larger share of the allowances funding that would remain.

I think Members who are prudent and conservative, who apportion their funds over a full year, should not be penalized simply because the funds would run short before the end of the fiscal year.

We would be moving in exactly the wrong direction. We would, in effect, be pushing people to make wasteful expenditures in a hurry-up fashion and not to make the kind of rational expenditures that would account in the longrun for savings, for a number of Members return funds to the Treasury as a result of their planned and rational expenditures over a full year.

So I see no value in this sort of an across-the-board approach to funding which would fall upon the Members in a very inequitable way, and I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. The gentleman said in his statement that the recommendation before the House from his committee is \$17 million less. I would ask the gentleman: \$17 million less than what?

□ 1150

Mr. FAZIO. Than the authorized figure.

Mr. ROEMER. Is the gentleman asking that less money be spent this year than last? Is it \$17 million less than we spent last year?

Mr. FAZIO. That is the figure authorized by the Committee on House Administration under the rules of the House and the law of the land. We have a figure in the bill that is \$17 million below what we could be appropriating if we went to the authorized amount. We are not going to the extent that the House Administration Committee felt was necessary. We are not going to the extent they felt justifiable based on the spiraling increases in expenditures that affect the Members' accounts.

Mr. ROEMER. If the gentleman will yield for a further question: I know the gentleman wants to present the facts straight to the House and I do not want anybody in the House, nor does the gentleman from California, to think that the recommendations before the House now, before the Bartlett amendment, would actually cut what is being spent in this area. What is being spent in this area is up from last year, I believe. Am I incorrect?

Mr. FAZIO. I did not make any implication that there was a cut in the appropriation under last year. What I am saying is that the increase over last

year is far below what could have been appropriated had we gone along with the amounts authorized, the numbers under the provisions of section 57 of title 2 of the United States Code.

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to take this time to announce that at the proper time I am going to be offering an amendment which will allow Members on an individual basis to do what the author of this amendment wants us to do in the generic today. For a long time, frankly, I have been frustrated by Members of this body who will vote "No" and then take the pay anyway or vote "No" and take the office allowances anyway.

So, after this amendment is disposed of, one way or another, at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment which will provide that no part of the funds for office expenses for any Member shall be available above the level in effect on January 1, 1983, unless that individual Member certifies to the Committee on House Administration that that additional funding is necessary.

Because this Member is tired of being cheap shotted on these issues, I intend to insert in the RECORD at the end of this fiscal year, when the report to the Clerk becomes available, a comparison between the votes on this coming amendment and the actual amounts spent by each of those Members in their office accounts for the coming year.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Am I correct in hearing what the gentleman is suggesting? Are you suggesting that you are going to propose an amendment that would actually require that an individual Member would have the opportunity or the responsibility to sign off and indicate before God and everybody that he needed that extra money?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Well, the gentleman amazes me. You want to cause a small revolution around here?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. I am sure a number of persons who will vote for this amendment are perfectly sincere, but I think all of us do know there are a good many Members who do occasionally, at least on occasion, pose for holy pictures on questions like this, knowing full well that the body will react in a way which will still enable those individuals to spend the money which they pretend they are against.

The amendment that I am going to offer will allow them to avoid that ethical trap. Also, I would suggest, that the report which I intend to insert in the RECORD will, I think, enable us to know exactly who is sincere and who is not on this issue.

I also want to make the point as the gentleman from California has made, we can literally be put out of business these days by tailored, well-organized lobbying campaigns.

I received over 40,000 letters just on the withholding issue this year. That cost an amazing amount of money to process that mail; it cost an amazing amount of money to print the responses and to type the responses and to send them out and it just seems to me that we ought to recognize the fact that we need to do our business and that is what this committee recommendation is trying to do. I would also suggest that in my opinion, most of our offices are technological dinosaurs. We have not yet moved into the modern age in terms of modernizing the functioning of our offices. We do not use the technology available because in many instances Members simply do not have the money to do so. If you compare the technical way that your offices are run with the way any modern business is run today, it is a laughing stock by comparison.

We do not make intelligent use of computer terminals and all of the other technology available to us, because we have been very restrained and limited in the resources which we have laid a claim to.

I suggest if you want to push us back even further into the dinosaur age, vote for this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all endorse the amendment and hope my endorsement of it will not destroy it.

Mr. OBEY. It might put it at considerable risk.

Mr. WALKER. I realize that might put it in considerable jeopardy; that is the reason I make the statement.

I think the gentleman has a good idea. I would hope the gentleman would also include in that amendment, though, that the money saved through that would directly go back to the taxpayers in the U.S. Treasury, would not simply revert to the Speaker's discretionary fund.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is free to nitpick his own amendment. I would prefer to offer my own amendment.

Mr. WALKER. So, your amendment is going to allow the Speaker to spend money that is saved?

Mr. OBEY. My amendment will do exactly what I said it would do.

The gentleman is free to mischaracterize anything he wants. I would not be surprised because it has happened so often around here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a strong discussion of the amendment. Let me suggest to my colleagues that I think this is an amendment that both parties can support and that every Member of the House can support comfortably.

Last year we spent more money on expenses than we have in any year in the history of the body. We appropriated \$49,791,000 for fiscal year 1983. We added a supplemental appropriation of \$7,946,000. The supplemental combined with the appropriation amounted to a total of \$57,737,000.

The gentleman from Texas is proposing a \$2.5 million increase over the \$57,737,000. It is not a draconian cut. It is not a cut in our ability to modernize. It is a significant increase in the amount of money available. If you would oppose the amendment, fair enough, but do not oppose it because it cuts our expenses. It increases our expense allowance compared to prior years. Do not oppose it because it would cut our ability to serve our constituency; the amount appropriated is higher than last year. What the gentleman proposes is dramatically higher than what we have ever appropriated for expenses in the history of this institution.

If you support it, support it because a 5-percent increase as the committee announced as their overall goal is a reasonable increase, versus the very large increase proposed by the committee. The point is: it is an increase, but it is a responsible increase.

Do we not owe the working men and women of this country at least this example of holding our increases to reasonable levels?

I hope all Members will consider this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I had not intended to speak further on this matter. However, in thinking over the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) it struck me that it would be of some value to discuss further that element which he has raised.

I served for a couple of years on the Committee on House Administration and daily fought the battle of attempting to hold down expenses around here. Indeed it is a battle that is worthwhile. But within the committee process you do what you can do in terms of the numbers that we deal with in this House.

□ 1200

The chairman has indicated that this appropriation is some \$17 million under that which has been authorized by the House Administration Committee. Let me share with my colleagues a piece of what that means. It means this: Earlier in the year Members received a letter that said Members were authorized to spend a number of dollars in your House account. For example, the members were given more flexibility in terms of transferring money from a personnel account to a House account, a major adjustment in terms of the policy development there.

Now frankly, that puts us in the position of attempting to guesstimate what the Members really will spend and appropriate that money to a reasonable level.

The reality is that none of us has to spend the money. And it is my judgment that we should not spend all that money unless it is absolutely necessary in terms of our individual district.

The facts are, however, that my friends in the House, especially those who have some political sense, recognize the importance of communicating effectively and consistently with their constituents. Ofttimes one will find from the RECORD that the very Members who rise and speak loudest about holding back the costs are the very Members who go beyond the limit in terms of their individual office expense.

I frankly think it might be a very interesting process to find ourselves in the position where we had to sign off relative to that necessity before we spend the money.

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I totally agree with what the Member has been saying that quite often office accounts are certainly stretched out and used to the fullest extent.

What I find very interesting, though, is here we are having a major increase in office accounts, which is the taxpayers' money, for Members of Congress to further their own political ambitions at times, and yet, with many people campaigning for office who would use private dollars to further their political ambitions, we try to limit their expenditures, as if some-

how using the private sector money is more adverse than using the taxpayers' money to further our own ambitions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If I could respond, I am sure that the gentleman and I are not among those who try to limit those expenditures on the part of the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, before completing my remarks, I first want to compliment the gentleman from Texas for a very thoughtful amendment. It raises a side of this discussion that is very important.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman from California a great deal. I think that this House needs to get back on course in considering what this amendment proposes to do. I know the gentleman from California has attempted to control the rate of growth and I respect the amendment that would be offered to control the rate of growth individually. But this body has an institutional obligation, a collective obligation to control the total rate of growth and I think this body has the right to say that a 16-percent rate of growth in 1984, in addition to the rate of growth that has been built in for each of the past 4 or 5 years, is an unreasonable amount.

I know the gentleman is sincere and he has worked hard on the committee, but I think this body has a collective responsibility, in addition to the individual responsibilities that have been debated today on the floor.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Texas and I would like to commend him for offering this amendment for consideration by the House.

Let us remember that in the consideration of this bill we are talking about statutory staff for the House, Members' allowances, and what have you, which are on a fiscal year basis, October 1 to September 30.

Several months ago we had before the House consideration of a measure for investigative staff, which is on a calendar year basis. The Members may recall that when the investigative staff issue came before the House, it came under a parliamentary process which precluded any Member from offering an amendment to reduce the amount. We had an up or down vote on total funding.

So I am pleased that in this instance the Rules Committee has at least permitted Members to offer amendments to reduce the level of funding that I

believe is consistent with our respect for taxpayers' interests.

I noticed in analyzing this bill that the proposal that we are asked to vote on in this amendment—bear in mind, we in our office account for office expenses now have between \$110,000 and \$120,000 a year, the variable being dependent on the length of the distance of our office from the Capitol.

The bill in its form before us without this amendment would increase this amount by some 16 percent over what was expended in the preceding year.

Now, I do not know how that reacts on the Members of this body, but it strikes me that it really is not a responsible position for any of us to take to explain to our constituents that we are going to increase the allowance for office expenses by 16 percent.

We have a deficit, as we all know, of close to \$200 billion, an inflation rate of under 4 percent and we are going to take a position that will authorize an increase of this magnitude? It is just not responsible.

So, the gentleman from Texas suggesting that we limit the increase to 4.3 percent, I think, is a very rational and reasonable proposal.

We all know that really the problem with staffing in this House took off in 1975. Up until that time when one looks at the historical trend, it was in concert with the demands of the institution. We all know in 1975 that we had a large group of young, enterprising, activist legislators who came here after the election of November 1974 and these new activist legislators wanted to be involved in the action in a very material way, so they proliferated subcommittees in this House, and they proliferated staff, and the proliferation continues on ad nauseum. In fact, it continues to this day.

I would suggest that the responsible thing for us to do today is to adopt this amendment and limit this increase to 4.3 percent.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for it, the gentleman has finally found his acorn. It was that group that came in 1974 that passed the reforms that gave the Republicans a guaranteed one-third of the total cost of the staff for running the committees. And I recall the gentleman's first day on our committee when he moved that we go back to the 1974 levels of staffing and the Republican Members of the committee were a little bit stunned when he wanted to wipe out the increase on our staff because it was entirely new Republicans who were hired after that rule was adopted. And some of us

thought that we were overly generous at that time.

I am glad to see that the gentleman is bringing that point up.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Since the gentleman has made a reference to what has happened on statutory staff, maybe the gentleman would like to talk about what has happened on investigative staff.

We members of the minority Republicans have the unenviable posture of only having 15 percent—I repeat 15 percent—of the investigative staff and we have that, of course, at the sufferance of the majority. Any time we try to tinker with that we are reminded, "If you don't be quiet and retire in your corner as quiet children, we will even reduce that 15 percent."

So I am not sure that the point is well taken that equity has been done.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how we got off onto staffing because we were talking about Members' allowances.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. The gentleman brought it up.

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman in the well brought the issue up. And I think it is important to reiterate: We have not had a net increase in staffing of the committees in the House of Representatives since 1978. We have actually had a net reduction since then. We have had a reduction of 143 people since 1980.

So the peak years the gentleman talks about were the early seventies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DANNEMEYER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional minutes.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, the point the gentleman has made with respect to numbers of staff is substantially accurate, but what the gentleman did not say is that the cost to the taxpayers of paying those staff members since 1975 has gone up 225 percent and during that period of time the CPI has increased by 95 percent.

The point is we have too many staff and they are too highly paid. The responsible thing is to adopt this amendment.

□ 1210

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound a question or two in a very serious vein to the chairman of the subcommittee. There have been discussions mentioned here on the floor

about various funds, and I am really trying to get an answer.

What happens when a Member tenders back unexpended funds from his accounts? Where do those funds go?

Mr. FAZIO. Ultimately, those funds go back to the Treasury. Those funds are replaced in the Treasury.

Now, there is, in every appropriation subcommittee's domain, the ability to do some reprogramming. Occasionally, just as in the case recently, very prominently the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, a reprogramming was done to further the interests of the administration. But this is not the norm. The funding which is not spent by the Members in this account goes back to the Treasury. So Members who are not profligate, who are tightfisted and who do plan and spend funds in a very conservative way are making a contribution by sending that funding back.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Do the funds go directly to an account from the Member's account to the Treasury, or do they go a circuitous route through other funds? Because there have been statements made here and, very frankly, I was not aware that there was such a thing as a discretionary fund or a contingency fund. I wonder if the chairman will explain what these are, where the money goes if it is tendered back by a Member.

Mr. FAZIO. It is my understanding that they lie in the Treasury until expended. And, if not spent by the end of the fiscal year, will revert to the Treasury.

Now, the thing that I think is most important to point out is that we have not appropriated all of the allowances, anyway. I have made that point more than once, and I think it is important to reiterate it. We are well below what we could be appropriating in this measure as is. In fact, the figure 16 percent has been bandied about here, in terms of the increase. That is not even using a full year base. We have a 9-month base where increases were made in response to the requests of the Members to the House Administration Committee. We are really talking about a much smaller percentage increase if you annualize that increase into the fiscal year 1983 amounts already appropriated.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Could I ask a direct question, and I am sincere in my question because I do not know the answer? Is there such a thing as a Speaker's discretionary fund?

Mr. FAZIO. I am not aware of any such fund. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe, alluded to it earlier. I am not aware of any. I am not aware of any funds that the Speaker has available that is not clearly identified in the funds provided to the leadership and which is clearly labeled in the bill. Of course, there are also funds clearly labeled for the ma-

jority, and minority leaders, and the whips and deputy whips.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. So far as the chairman knows, there is no fund set aside in this appropriation that goes to the Speaker except for the Speaker's—

Mr. FAZIO. It is appropriated to the leadership offices. It is very clearly demarcated under that heading. There is no slush fund, no secret fund, no Speaker's fund made up of funds that come back from Members.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Now, there is a contingency fund, is that correct, contingent fund? Although the report says that there is no contingent fund per se.

Mr. FAZIO. There is a rather arcane term that is used here. It is mostly used in case law. There is, on page 4 of the bill, "Contingent expenses of the House," for example. This is a term that goes back to—

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. These moneys that a Member would tender back would not go to this fund that does not really exist?

Mr. FAZIO. No; it is my understanding they would go to the Treasury.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. It is very clear the Speaker does not sign the check to pay for these bills, nor does anyone here. They are drawn from the Treasury upon certification by the House of Representatives or the appropriate responsible unit of the House. So they never were drawn from the Treasury, so they are not paid back to the Treasury. They remain in the Treasury. When you do not use all of the funds that are available to you, they remain in the Treasury and do not come down to the House in a special account down here in the Sergeant at Arms Office. It remains in the Treasury.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. The gentleman is on the committee and a leader in this area, very knowledgeable. If a Member tenders back unexpended funds, then in fact those funds will not be credited or available for the committee to distribute to other Members who might have gone over the maximum?

Mr. MYERS. Actually, if the gentleman will continue to yield to me, it is a misnomer to say you tender back or offer back. You did not have it, in the first place. It was available, but you did not spend it. When we beat our chests and say we returned it back to the Treasury, that is not quite true. We just did not draw it. We save the taxpayers, yes. And I think our Members are to be commended for doing that. Just about every Member does not use all of the funds available.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is exactly correct. Unless we voucher the money, it remains in the Treasury. We do not send it back because it does not come to us unless we specifically request it.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, that leaves only one unanswered question, then. I have been concerned about this, and I approached the chairman, who was very gracious in trying to explain the thing to me. If indeed I, as a Member, choose not to spend \$40,000, let us say, of my clerk-hire authorization, according to the explanation that was just rendered, it means that I will not have drawn that from the Treasury. Then the only question that has to be answered, then, with respect to my \$40,000 in this hypothetical, is: Is that \$40,000 now available to be drawn from the Treasury by X or Y within the process—the Speaker, the House Administration, the chairman of the committee—on reprogramming? That is what bothers me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. FAZIO and by unanimous consent, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, unless the money is appropriated, the money remains in the Treasury with all the other revenues of the Federal Government. If it is appropriated in general to elements of the legislative branch, then it could be spent up to the appropriated level. But I think the important point here is that individual Members are authorized by the House Administration Committee under the rules of the House and the law of the land to expend certain amounts of money for the use of their office for official expenses.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I would like to know, then, what is the policy of the committee with respect to those funds that I choose not to draw from the Treasury? Is the policy of the committee, and of the House Administration, and of the Speaker, and all of the others who control this money, is it the policy of those elements to use this unexpended money from the Treasury for other programs, without coming back to the House for approval?

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield, no. The House Administration Committee perhaps could better answer the gentleman's questions.

They meet officially and determine what would be the proper level of expenditures for a Member per official expense item. We have been able to reduce those amounts each year. In this bill we have reduced, as I have indicated, some \$17 million under what Members of this body are allowed to spend. So that funding, to start with, comes off the top. If we appropriate too much, and I do not remember that we have ever done that, then what individual Members do not spend on their own is also added to that additional money that is not expended. That stays in the Treasury.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a question that every Member must have an understanding of when we first come here. It is not unlike any other appropriation. This is the reason we have line items here. This is a special account we are referring to right here that cannot be changed, interchanged over to the Speaker or some other account within the legislative branch without reprogramming. There is a procedure that if some other facet, some other department within the legislative branch needs the money, they can come back to this committee and request reprogramming. But it has to be approved by the committee. And that is not unlike any other appropriation. It cannot be spent just willy-nilly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ROEMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think what the gentleman from Indiana was saying is that if this money is unspent, it could be reprogrammed. For example, the page school, on which I understand \$10 million, or some sum, is going to be spent, came out of allowances of people who tendered it back. Is that the type of thing the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MYERS. If the gentleman will yield, that was a contingency account that the House had. The gentleman asked about the contingency account. That money that was used to develop the page dormitory, the old Capitol Hill Hotel, was used from the contingency account. It came back to the committee for approval. It was the understanding from the committee that that money would be spent to develop, and to modernize, and make the facility available for the students.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, let me just put the question direct, and

let us see if we understand what just happened. As I understand it, we appropriate a certain amount of money, and the committee allocates it, programs it, so to speak, to each individual Member. If a Member in his or her wisdom does not spend all of his or her allocation, like myself, and turns it back, or, as the gentleman, says, does not withdraw it from the Treasury, then the committee has the right to reprogram and actually spend that money on other Members of Congress.

This is the first time I have heard that explanation. Did I hear it wrong?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I would yield to the chairman.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

To use the example that the gentleman gave, we reprogrammed in the account of the Architect of the Capitol for House office buildings funds that were to be used for some other project in the House office buildings account to renovate the Congressional Hotel, another House office building item, for the page dorm. So there is the ability to reprogram within an account. But I do not believe that the example of the gentleman from Louisiana is appropriate. We could not have reprogrammed, for example, funds that were left in the Treasury by individual Members to renovate a building for pages. That is not within our committee's authority.

□ 1220

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Missouri yield just for one moment?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Then the only other question that I have is how is it that the committee has the power to reprogram? I never had a voice, that I know of, in what the committee did with the page allocation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GEKAS and by unanimous consent, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, why is it, then, that I, as a rank and file Member of the House, did not have a vote on how the money that I left unexpended became reprogrammed for a page school, or whatever it was. That is a real, ultimate, important question.

If the answer is that that is the way it is because the committee has that power, we have got to change that.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Let me reiterate, we did not reprogram individual funds, funds that were not taken from the Treasury by Members, for the renovation of the Congressional Hotel. That came from an account that was set aside for the Architect of the Capitol for House office buildings.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman, I think.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is a limitation on how much can be reprogramed by a percentage factor, but if we had to deal here on the House floor with every reprogramming request, it would occupy most of our time, and we are not getting our work done now.

So we have to depend on committees for something. That is the reason we have standing committees. The committees, I can assure the gentleman, having served on the Committee on Appropriations for the past 13 years, are very diligent and very careful how those moneys are reprogramed. We turn down about as many reprogramming requests as we approve.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the candor and the discussion. It was not meant to take sides on this amendment or any other, but to clarify exactly what happens to this money, because it was certainly not clear before we had this colloquy and I appreciate the participation.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief, because I think this has been an intriguing and good discussion and debate about individual responsibility. This House needs to have that debate and perhaps have that debate much more often in detail.

But what we have learned today is that we are still not quite sure what happens to reprogramed money, whether it goes back to the leadership office or the committee or to reprogramming. The point is that this today is the only opportunity to address collective responsibility for the rate of growth, totally not individually, but

totally of the 16-percent increase that is built into this committee bill.

I think it has been a good debate, but I do think, Mr. Chairman, that we do need to get back to the point of the collective responsibility of this House.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there was one comment made during the discussion here that concerned me and that was that it sounded like someone indicated that a great number, or a majority, of us returned money at the end of the term. It would seem to me if the majority or a great number return money, I have to ask the question, then, why are we increasing these outlays by 16 percent?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKLIN. I yield to the chairman to answer that question.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the 16-percent figure is not accurate because it is not based on a full prior year. The increases that were made by the Committee on House Administration were based on a 9-month period, and, most recently, a 5-month period, so the figure of 16 percent is somewhat inflated.

The point is, though, that we assume there will be reductions in what Members spend right here when we make a \$17 million cut in the authorized figure in the appropriations bill. We also assume Members will be even more restrictive, but we are not sure how individually they will be restrictive, so we must leave some room so that Members' personal decisions can be accounted for.

I fully expect that we will make additional savings, I would hope we would, and that will be money that remains in the Treasury.

My point is, if you wish to change the rules by which we expand these funds, the gentleman should go to the Committee on House Administration and make them there. By going across the board, we are simply making sure at some point in the fiscal year we are going to cut funds out and some people are going to have plenty and some people are not going to have an adequate amount. It is a very inequitable and unfair way to do it. I would urge the gentleman to go to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I read the figures from the committee's own publication,

they indicate a proposal by the committee to expend \$67,200,000 in the committee bill. Last year we appropriated \$49 million. The supplemental, if it is approved, has \$7,900,000-some in it. The 16-percent increase is not an increase over last year's appropriation; it is an increase over last year's appropriation and last year's supplemental. So it is a full 16 percent over the entire total amount.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKLIN. I yield to the chairman for a response.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make is that the base we are trying to take this percentage from does not fully take into consideration the increases that were mandated by the resolutions of the Committee on House Administration.

So, in effect, what I am saying is that it is a percentage increase, but it is much less than is being represented here.

I want to make this point: In not funding the full amount authorized, we have reduced the average funding for Members' allowances by \$38,636 for each one of us. That, I think, is a significant reduction.

Mr. MACK. If the gentleman will yield further, the question that I am trying to get an answer to is that, again, if the great majority, or if a large number of us have returned funds, and in fact this is a 16-percent increase over a period of time, it does not make sense to me that we have to make these increases if we are not spending what we have all been allocated in the first place.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, even though Members are returning funds, we are anticipating additional increases, even though we also assume that Members may not in every case take all funds that are available to them. So the increase could be much greater, as I have indicated. We have made a modest increase. It is much less than 16 percent on a comparable annual year.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield just briefly?

Mr. FRANKLIN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ALBOSTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me just explain how I see this whole situation. If you have a large congressional district, and you have three offices or four offices to serve the public in that vast, spread-out district, take the 11th District of Michigan, represented by one of your political party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. FRANKLIN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. ALBOSTA and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRANKLIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALBOSTA. That Member has to have offices both in the Lower Peninsula and in the Upper Peninsula. Obviously he needs more money to maintain all those offices. I have the third largest congressional district east of the Mississippi River. I have to have three congressional offices in my district because from one end to the other is about 200 miles. Obviously it is going to take more money to staff those and to have those people there and to maintain the cost of those offices.

So everybody should, if they do not need the money, base it on their own best judgment in the kind of service that we give equally to our constituents. That is the important issue in this. I believe that the Committee on Appropriations properly allows enough so that those of us who have larger districts can give our constituents the same kind of service as those districts that are more consolidated where it can all be done from one office.

□ 1230

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will take a little time here, if I may, to engage the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), the chairman of the subcommittee, in a bit of conversation. I just want to try to see whether I can clarify this matter a little bit further.

If every Member of Congress spent every dime permitted him under the authorization, is there sufficient money in this appropriation to cover that amount of money?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. No, there is \$17 million less than that.

Mr. WALKER. There is \$17 million less than that amount in here?

Mr. FAZIO. That is right.

Mr. WALKER. So we start with an assumption in this appropriation that some Members are going to save money while others are not; is that correct?

Mr. FAZIO. We assume there will be a variety of approaches to saving money, and that every Member will save some, although we know that some will not and many will.

Mr. WALKER. Is the figure we have in here in terms of the \$17 million at all in reference to the historic amounts that have been left in the Treasury? In other words, can we

assume that there is about \$17 million left at the Treasury by Members last year?

Mr. FAZIO. We have simply attempted, using historic analysis, to make a judgment about what will be expended.

Mr. WALKER. I am just trying to get some idea here. Was there about \$17 million left last year in the Treasury by individual Members who did not spend their amounts or spend their allowances?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I could not answer the gentleman right off the top of my head, but obviously we did not appropriate all the money that was authorized in any year recently.

Mr. WALKER. Do we have any idea as to how much was left?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, first let me say to the gentleman that obviously it is not in the Treasury because we never appropriate the full amount. That is one factor the gentleman has to keep in mind. It was not placed there by an appropriations bill. There is simply none there to draw on.

Mr. WALKER. That is apparent. I am trying to get back to the issue that we discussed as to how this money ends up eventually being either not spent or spent. I am trying to get some handle here as to how much money might be down at the Treasury.

If I am being told, as we were told here earlier in the discussion, that if I do not spend my money and that money lays in the Treasury and is, therefore, a savings to the taxpayer, then I assume that all the money I did not spend last year ended up staying in the Treasury and all the money the gentleman from California did not spend last year ended up staying in the Treasury.

I want to know how much money ended up staying in the Treasury as a result of all our savings last year. Do we not have some kind of figure of that type,

Mr. FAZIO. We do not have a figure here. We will help the gentleman to obtain that figure if he desires.

Mr. WALKER. No, I do not think we can assume that some other branch of Government is going to spend the money that I saved. I was under the impression, based upon the previous discussion, that if I saved the money and it stayed in the Treasury, as I think the gentleman from Indiana said, it was a savings to the taxpayer.

Now, that is what I am trying to get a handle on. How much money did this House save last year through that procedure? How much money stayed in the Treasury?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman brings up a good question. I think we could work on this and research it and bring the answer to the attention of the body. It is a good question, but I do not have an answer to it at the moment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am please to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to try to help the gentleman, and I know that he honestly seeks information and wants facts concerning the operation of the House.

The gentleman will note on page 5 of the bill that there are administrative provisions. There are administrative provisions such as these in most of the appropriation bills. The provisions which we see there deal with the question the gentleman is raising, which is reprogramming. Whether these are surplus moneys, it tells us what accounts may be reprogrammed for salaries and expenses.

In a conversation with the committee staff, I asked, "How much in 1982 was reprogrammed? What is the total sum?"

To the best of their knowledge, it was about \$500,000.

The reprogramming in this bill is handled in the same way as it is in every other bill. No distinction is made between this account or this bill and one for the executive agencies. In the executive agencies we may limit a reprogramming in terms of percentages that might vary from agency to agency. I might advise the gentleman. But the principle of reprogramming is present in every appropriation bill, or nearly so, and the sum that was reprogrammed last year was about \$500,000, I am advised.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and that is most helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, that is most helpful, because when we look on page 5, we find out, for instance, that if we save money in allowances and expenses and in Members' clerk hire, for example, one place that could be reprogrammed is special and select committees, for example. So, therefore, if some committee decided to do a lot of traveling, in fact the money I saved from my account could go to a committee that was deciding to do some foreign traveling or do some traveling around the country.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield, but I want to point out that I do not want to misrepresent this. I am just trying to go by what the gentleman pointed out is the language here. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has an agile and an imaginative mind.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I hope so.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, I am highly respectful of him and delighted that he is in the same corridor with me.

My understanding is that if the committee ceilings are established by House resolution, we cannot reprogram above the resolution any more into an individual Member's account. We could reprogram above the levels established by the House and by the House Administration Committee.

So even though the gentleman fears that, I am told in reality that that cannot occur because there are other checks in place that would prohibit it.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the discussion—and it is an apt discussion and an important one—about what happens to residue money, money in the reservoir, money not used and expended and all the rest, we seem to be forgetting the amendment before us that was offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT). I hope the gentleman agrees. There has been some issue on what the amendment does and what it does not do.

Our friend, the gentleman from California, in a good defense of the committee's position, has tried to make the point that in the appropriation process the committee has not increased from fiscal year 1984 over fiscal year 1983 by 16 percent. The numbers that I have are completely different. The numbers that I have shown that we are increasing by \$10 million in the official expenses of Members, and if we put that over a base figure of \$57 million, that is 16.4 percent. The gentleman from Texas would increase by only 4.3 percent. That is the issue before the House.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to clarify this point that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ROEMER) just made.

I do not think there should be any confusion. No one is trying to make a case with statistics that are not accurate.

But I want to make this clear for the Members. Since late 1982 there have been two increases approved by the Committee on House Administration. We could talk about why there were 43 percent increases in the cost of travel, 30 percent increases in the cost of travel to many cities around the country, paper product increases, et cetera. If we had fully funded those increases, we would have had to appro-

priate far more in 1983, not the \$57 million we actually did appropriate.

That is the figure the gentleman should be comparing when he tries to come up with a percentage increase to the \$67 million in the 1984 bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we are clearly trying to make our case on the merits, and I appreciate the patience of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT).

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 160, not voting 116, as follows:

(Roll No. 157)

AYES—156

Andrews (TX)	Gunderson	Paul
Applegate	Hall, Ralph	Penny
Archer	Hall, Sam	Petri
Barnard	Hammerschmidt	Pickle
Bartlett	Hansen (ID)	Porter
Bateman	Hartnett	Ray
Bennett	Hiller	Regula
Bereuter	Hillis	Ridge
Bethune	Hopkins	Ritter
Billirakis	Hubbard	Roberts
Bliley	Hunter	Robinson
Boehlert	Hyde	Roemer
Britt	Jacobs	Rogers
Broomfield	Jenkins	Roth
Brown (CO)	Jones (OK)	Roukema
Broyhill	Kasich	Rowland
Burton	Kemp	Schaefer
Byron	Kindness	Schroeder
Carper	Kogovsek	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Kramer	Sharp
Coats	Lagomarsino	Shelby
Coleman (MO)	Latta	Skeen
Conable	Leath	Smith (NE)
Cooper	Levitas	Smith (NJ)
Coughlin	Livingston	Smith, Robert
Courter	Loeffler	Snowe
Crane, Daniel	Lowery (CA)	Snyder
Crane, Philip	Lujan	Solomon
D'Amours	Lungren	Spence
Daniel	Mack	Stenholm
Dannemeyer	MacKay	Stump
Daub	Marriott	Sundquist
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Tauke
Dreier	Martin (NC)	Tauzin
Duncan	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Durbin	McCollum	Thomas (GA)
Early	McCurdy	Valentine
Eckart	McDonald	Vander Jagt
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Vandergriff
Emerson	McKernan	Volkmer
English	McNulty	Walgren
Erdreich	Michel	Walker
Erlenborn	Miller (OH)	Weber
Evans (IA)	Mollohan	Whittaker
Fiedler	Montgomery	Williams (OH)
Fish	Moore	Winn
Franklin	Moorhead	Wise
Gekas	O'Brien	Wyllie
Gilman	Olin	Yates
Gingrich	Ortiz	Yatron
Goodling	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gregg	Packard	Zschau

NOES—160

Ackerman	Barnes	Bosco
Akaka	Bates	Boucher
Albosta	Bedell	Boxer
Anderson	Beilenson	Breaux
Andrews (NC)	Boggs	Brooks
Annunzio	Boner	Carr
Anthony	Bonior	Chappell
Aspin	Borski	Clarke

Coleman (TX)	Kastenmeier	Perkins
Coyne	Kennelly	Rahall
Daschle	Kildee	Rangel
Davis	LaFalce	Ratchford
de la Garza	Lantos	Reld
Dellums	Lehman (CA)	Rinaldo
Dicks	Leland	Rodino
Dingell	Levin	Roe
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Rose
Dorgan	Long (LA)	Rostenkowski
Dowdy	Long (MD)	Roybal
Downey	Lowry (WA)	Rudd
Dwyer	Lukens	Savage
Dyson	Lundine	Sawyer
Edgar	Madigan	Scheuer
Edwards (CA)	Markey	Schumer
Evans (IL)	Matsui	Seiberling
Fascell	Mavroules	Simon
Fazio	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)
Feighan	McCloskey	Solarz
Ferraro	McDade	Spratt
Flippo	McHugh	Stangeland
Foley	Mikulski	Stark
Ford (MI)	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Ford (TN)	Mineta	Studds
Frank	Minish	Swift
Fuqua	Mitchell	Synar
Gejdenson	Moakley	Tallon
Gephardt	Molinari	Taylor
Gibbons	Moody	Towns
Gonzalez	Mrazek	Traxler
Gray	Murphy	Udall
Green	Murtha	Vento
Guarini	Myers	Waxman
Hamilton	Natcher	Weaver
Harrison	Neal	Wheat
Hatcher	Nowak	Whitley
Hefner	Oakar	Whitten
Hertel	Oberstar	Wolf
Horton	Obey	Wolpe
Howard	Ottlinger	Wright
Hoyer	Owens	Wyden
Hughes	Parris	Young (MO)
Jeffords	Patman	Zablocki
Jones (NC)	Patterson	
Kaptur	Pease	

NOT VOTING—116

Addabbo	Gore	Nielson
Alexander	Gradison	Panetta
AuCoin	Gramm	Pashayan
Badham	Hall (IN)	Pepper
Berman	Hall (OH)	Price
Beverly	Hance	Pritchard
Biaggi	Hansen (UT)	Pursell
Boland	Harkin	Quillen
Bonker	Hawkins	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Heftel	Russo
Bryant	Hightower	Sabo
Campbell	Holt	Schneider
Carney	Huckaby	Schulze
Chandler	Hutto	Shannon
Chapple	Ireland	Shaw
Cheney	Johnson	Shumway
Clay	Jones (TN)	Shuster
Coelho	Kazen	Sikorski
Collins	Kolter	Siljander
Conte	Kostmayer	Sisisky
Conyers	Leach	Skelton
Corcoran	Lehman (FL)	Slattery
Craig	Lent	Smith (FL)
Crockett	Levine	Smith, Denny
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	St Germain
Dickinson	Lipinski	Staggers
Dixon	Lloyd	Stratton
Dymally	Lott	Torres
Edwards (AL)	Marlenee	Torricelli
Fields	Martin (NY)	Vucanovich
Florio	Martinez	Watkins
Foglietta	McCain	Weiss
Forsythe	McGrath	Whitehurst
Fowler	McKinney	Williams (MT)
Frenzel	Mica	Wilson
Frost	Morrison (CT)	Wirth
Garcia	Morrison (WA)	Wortley
Gaydos	Nelson	Young (AK)
Glickman	Nichols	

□ 1250

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Glickman for, with Mr. Boland against.

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Morrison of Connecticut against.

Mr. Lewis of Florida for, with Mr. Nelson of Florida against.

Mr. Corcoran for, with Mr. Lehman of Florida against.

Mr. Craig for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. SAVAGE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PACKARD, WISE, and BARNARD changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARTNETT

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 321 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$37,790,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration or the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTNETT: On page 16, line 24, strike out "\$37,790,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$35,543,550."

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. The proposed bill before us would increase that amount from last year's appropriation by 12 percent. This amendment would limit that increase to 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, since 1975 the appropriations for the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress have grown from \$13,345,000 to \$37,790,000. Now in that same period of time, of course, our clerk hire allowances have increased, our staff has increased in numbers, and the numbers of Congressmen of course have not increased.

We are now able with computers and with our terminals in our offices and with the increased personnel which we have in our offices to do a lot more of the research ourselves.

□ 1300

Now I commend the chairman of this subcommittee for what he has done and my colleagues on this side of the aisle for the work they have done in trying to hold down the expenses of this body.

I might just make an observation, Mr. Chairman, that this Member has

just returned from an international air show, where we were shown the latest technology, the latest research and development on behalf of 22 nations. And I might observe, Mr. Chairman, that the national news media of this country, I assume, flew at their own expense, many members of their staff, camera crews, and the like, to this international air show to try to embarrass Members of this body and the other body, who were conscientiously going about their job as elected representatives of the people, trying to learn the latest development in air and aerospace technology, so that when we appropriate money to buy the item we can do it with some type of expertise and good judgment.

And I think it is kind of passing strange, Mr. Chairman, that the same media who had to fly thousands of miles across the ocean to cover this international air show, where we probably spent some several thousands of dollars in travel, have not seen fit to even walk across the hall and grace us with their presence here today where we are trying to save the taxpayers millions of dollars in annual appropriations here on the floor. They need to let the American people know who really is wasting their tax dollars.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee possibly would accept this amendment and, if so, there is no use for me to go on and take any more time. I have trespassed on enough of the gentleman's time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTNETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have looked at this amendment and while I think we could differ over the degree to which the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress aids the Members in the conduct of their duties and their constituents as well, I think the gentleman's request is reasonable and I certainly could accept that.

Mr. HARTNETT. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTNETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have no problem with the amendment. We congratulate the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HARTNETT. I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday and today, there was considerable debate on the staffing and funding of House commit-

tees. There was objection to the use of an omnibus committee funding resolution with the implication that it was a barrier to the reduction in staff and their costs by this House.

Mr. Chairman, the Members should know the facts. Prior to our adoption of an omnibus resolution for funding the studies and investigations of committees, there was a steady year in and year out increase in both committee authorizations and investigative staff levels. Members of the House voted on the authorizations committee by committee, blind to the bottom line total cost they were accruing.

Since use of an omnibus resolution, Members know the bottom line cost when we report from the Accounts Subcommittee; Members know the bottom line cost when we report from the House Administration Committee; and Members know the bottom line cost for each committee and all committees when they adopt the final resolution.

In contrast to the adoption of individual funding resolutions, under the adoption of omnibus resolutions, overall costs have been reduced and the number of staff has been cut. During the 97th Congress, committee investigative staff were reduced by 134 people for a savings of \$3,500,000. During the 97th Congress, the inflation rate rose by 11.5 percent and we cut investigative funding by 10 percent. When committees made their requests for 1983 funding, they had 21.5 percent less funds in constant dollars to spend than they had in the previous Congress.

Members have an opportunity to appear at hearings before the Accounts Subcommittee when we take up these requests committee by committee. If they have reason to believe a specific committee is overspending for staff or for any other purpose, they then have an opportunity to so testify and properly effect the resultant resolution. They are welcome and encouraged to provide us with this information.

The record should be clear, Mr. Chairman, under the old system of adopting individual committee resolutions, costs and staff went up. Since adoption of omnibus resolutions, costs and staff have gone down.

Mr. Chairman, the Accounts Subcommittee has done its job and done it well. The Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee should be applauded for its support of the floor's response to the recommendations made by the House Administration Committee.

The facts, when known, speak for themselves. I appreciate this opportunity to present them to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. HARTNETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs, \$107,077,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, to be available immediately upon enactment of this Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNTER: On page 12, line 3, strike out "\$107,077,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$97,819,050".

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and I think in discussing the amendment we should go back and review the history of franking expenditure.

This amendment addresses the expenditures of reimbursement that will be made for use of the franking privilege by Members of this House and I think it is interesting and important to look back to the year 1975 and through the present and look at the appropriations that were in fact expended for this purpose.

In 1975 we spent about \$38 million; 1976, \$46 million, with a supplemental of about \$16 million; 1977, \$46 million; 1978, \$48 million; 1979, \$64 million; 1980, \$50 million; 1981, \$36 million with a supplement of \$15 million; 1982, \$75 million; 1983, \$55 million, with a supplemental of \$37 million.

So the total last year that we expended, counting the supplemental and the appropriations bill, Mr. Chairman, was about \$93.1 million.

This amendment would limit the increase to 5 percent. If we do not adopt the amendment we are going to increase appropriations by about 15 percent to \$107 million, for franking expenditures.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I think that this is one place where we can demonstrate some fiscal discipline. We can remind Members that they must live within their means, especially with the election year coming on. I think that one very interesting set of statistics are the estimates for 1984, looked at along with the actual numbers of pieces of mail sent out under the frank for 1975 through 1984.

In 1975, Members of this House sent out 312.4 million pieces of mail under the frank. In 1983, we are sending out about 422 million pieces of mail, but we estimate for 1984, which happens to be an election year, that we will send out 839 million pieces of mail.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a reasonable amendment. It is an amendment, the debate of which should spark some restraint in the election year use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress. This is an opportunity to instill greater discipline in our congressional mailing practices.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to congratulate my colleague from California for bringing to the attention of the Members a very serious problem and that is the increasing amount to which we must use our franked mail privilege, but I think it is important to point out that we are in great measure responding to increasing contact from our constituents.

The gentleman from Michigan was just indicating to me that he had received over 20,000 pieces specifically in response to the issue that the Ways and Means Committee has been grappling with on the withholding of interest on dividends. And there are many, many other campaigns that the Members are subjected to which really are an effort to influence the course of our behavior here, our votes.

We are attempting in this appropriation to put up a sum of money that will accurately reflect what we anticipate the Members spending on their frank mail privilege. Last year I regret to say we were required to appropriate \$38 million for supplemental purposes. The 1983 supplemental bill, which has been approved by the House and sent to the other body, includes \$38 million out of the total of \$93 million that is the actual fiscal year 1983 level for franked mail; in other words, we did not estimate a sufficient amount last year when we made the initial appropriation for official mail.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that we have this terrific increase is because of the postage rate increase; am I correct, more than any other item in the bill?

Mr. FAZIO. There is both an increase in the average cost that we must reimburse the Postal Service for the combination of first and third-class mail that the Postal Service has estimated, the 840 million pieces that will be sent by Congress to our constituents. The carrysite cost per piece is 12.75 cents. So we are really attempting to reflect reality. We do not want to put a figure in here that will require a supplemental in the next fiscal year. We think this is truth in appropriations.

I would urge the defeat of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman pointing out that we have issues, as he did in his initial remarks, that we have issues and have had issues recently that have resulted in an increased mail flow from our constituents and he is referring to the withholding issues, but we have had issues like that in the past. We had the social security issue last year. And we are always going to have issues of importance coming before the American people.

This is the first time, I believe, in looking at my figures, that we have gone over the \$100 million mark in appropriations for reimbursement for the franking privilege. I think that is significant. I think that passing this amendment would at least make Members realize that we have to exercise some fiscal restraint and to some degree we do solicit response from our constituents. We do generate mail to some degree in this House and I think that that fact is manifested in this estimate of some 839 million pieces of mail we feel will probably be going out during the election year.

□ 1310

So even in light of the gentleman's remarks, I think that this is a responsible amendment. It does call for a 5-percent increase, and I think that that is enough.

Mr. FAZIO. I would simply say that if by some magic we could establish a figure that would reduce the Members' reliance on the frank or the general public interest in communicating with us, I could support the gentleman. But I do not think this is going to have the effect that he wishes. I should point out that the law states in 39 U.S.C. 3216, we shall pay out of a lump sum appropriation the franking privilege costs that we incur.

I wish I could support the gentleman's amendment. I simply cannot.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, because I think that a very incidious if not an outright charge, an insinuation, has been placed here in the RECORD by the gentleman sponsoring this amendment. I for one think that it is obligatory to address ourselves to it.

The gentleman stated—and I hope I am not quoting him incorrectly, I do not think I am—that because of the coming election environment, implying that there must be some abuse of the proper franking privilege on the part of Congressmen. This has been loosely bandied around throughout the country, and I for one take umbrage at that.

Does the gentleman from California have a specific instance in which this

privilege is now being abused or has been abused in the last year?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a response?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GONZALEZ and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAZIO was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I did not state that there was an abuse by the Members of this body of the franking privilege.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Then what is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. HUNTER. Let me finish my response.

The point I was making was based on this statistic—and let me read it to the gentleman very clearly: In 1983, we will send out 422.6 million pieces of mail from this body.

Now, the estimate that I have that I understand was derived through the committee for 1984, that is the election year, is 839.8 million pieces of mail. In other words, that means if these figures are correct that were placed before me, we are going to double our use of the franking privilege in 1984.

Now, I am not suggesting that that is an abuse. I am suggesting that we can, in these tough economic times, exercise some fiscal restraint in the coming year, and I do not think it is bad to remind the membership of this House that, although it is our privilege to frank, ultimately the taxpayers pay for it, and I do not think that doubling the use of the frank in an election year is a coincidence. I think it is, to some degree, because we are entering into an election cycle.

Mr. FAZIO. If I could reclaim my time, I appreciate the point the gentleman has made, and I hope it will be of some value to the Members.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond that you know and I know, as the chairman pointed out, that the cost is much greater this year than it was last year, so that is really not a viable comparison.

The point is that the effect of this amendment is to cut off our direct contact with our constituents. You know, Members of Congress are the closest link that the people in this wonderful country have to the Federal Government. What the gentleman is trying to do, in effect, is cut off our ability to communicate with our constituents.

The gentleman must also know that we had to hire—and no Member had any disagreement with this—20 people more in the mailrooms to deal with all of the volumes of mail that we are getting from our people. People demand a response to their inquiries and to their points of view about issues.

So, do not cut off our ability to communicate with the American people. Dialog is what we need here. We need to take our direction more from the American people, not less. And that is what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for her comments.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one last response to the gentleman's remarks and perhaps a misimpression.

This amendment does not ask for a cut in appropriations to reimburse for franked mail. It asks for a 5-percent increase.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's interest and I share his sentiments. I just do not think the approach that he takes at this time will have the effect that he intends, and I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very keenly about this, and I think every Member who respects his own honor and integrity ought to be just equally aroused.

The gentleman has still not answered clearly that insinuation that he made and has repeated, because he is now interpolating projections of increments and increases predicated on the assumption that only because of an election year environment will that increase take place.

Now, that is more than an insinuation. That is an accusation that either through direct or indirect means we are abusing this privilege. Of course, it is a privilege. It has been a privilege since the beginning of this institution, because it has been intended that we be as intimately in contact with our constituencies as is humanly possible to devise a system.

If the franking privilege in any way is unjustly curbed, for whatever reason, then we are hurting in our ability to the discharge our oath of office.

I think the gentleman ought to be compelled to show us factually, because if he wants to interpret these statistics that way, how does he interpret the unprecedented increment increase in just the last 3 months because of the inundation both in the House and the Senate by those withholding 10 percent protest coupons

that have arrived here in millions of numbers?

This is not an election year. Would the gentleman then say, as the Postmaster certainly has not, that he is confronted and our mail system in this House is confronted with an unprecedented demand, which ought to be reflected in the projections? I think that the insinuation is still there that there is a potential, if not the actual conclusion, that we will be abusing this privilege simply because we will be entering an election year.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I would like to tell the gentleman that I have cited the historical use of the frank from 1975 to the present, and it is a fact that on even-numbered years; that is, years in which we are running for election, the frank is used much more than it is in the odd-numbered years.

In 1984 we have an estimate of 839 million pieces of mail going out. That is twice what we have in this year.

Now, let me ask the gentleman this question: What is the gentleman's rationale, why does he think that increase is manifested in these statistics?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Well, it is very simple, in my opinion. If the gentleman had been here longer than he has been, he would realize that we confronted that issue and we passed reform legislation which, if the gentleman is correct in his conclusion, we will be violating, because in the prior years to the reform in which we were restricted in such things as mass mailing up to 60 days prior to an election, prior to that what does the gentleman's statistics show? That would be the best extrapolation of figures. And the gentleman does not have that, because the gentleman just has not been around here long enough to know what the problem really is and has been and what the Congress has already done.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out to my colleagues that we are not in any way suggesting a cut in the appropriation in this area in relation to past years. As recently as 1981, our total expenditures were \$52 million in this area. The amendment proposes \$97 million in this area.

□ 1320

The amendment is a significant increase over the total amount that was spent this year. The appropriation for this year was only \$55 million. The amount that is proposed by the com-

mittee is nearly double the amount that was initially appropriated last year. The amount that is proposed in the amendment is over \$97 million, which is 5 percent over the total amount that was appropriated last year including the supplement.

It is not a cut. It is not an attempt to cut off communication with constituents. It is a significant increase, but it is not a 15-percent increase over the biggest appropriation for mailing that we have ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREGG) there were—ayes 21, noes 32.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 173, not voting 125, as follows:

(Roll No. 158)

AYES—134

Anderson	Hartnett	Petri
Andrews (TX)	Hiller	Ray
Archer	Hopkins	Regula
Barnard	Hubbard	Ridge
Bartlett	Hughes	Rinaldo
Bennett	Hunter	Ritter
Bereuter	Hyde	Roberts
Bethune	Jacobs	Robinson
Billakis	Jeffords	Roemer
Bliley	Kasich	Rogers
Broomfield	Kemp	Roth
Brown (CO)	Kindness	Roukema
Burton	Kogovsek	Rudd
Clinger	Kramer	Schaefer
Coats	Latta	Schroeder
Conable	Leath	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Loeffler	Skeen
Coughlin	Lowery (CA)	Smith (NE)
Courter	Lujan	Smith, Robert
Crane, Daniel	Lungren	Snowe
Crane, Philip	Mack	Solomon
D'Amours	MacKay	Spence
Daniel	Madigan	Stangeland
Dannemeyer	Marriott	Stenholm
Daub	Martin (IL)	Stump
Davis	Martin (NC)	Sundquist
DeWine	McCandless	Tallon
Dreier	McCollum	Tauke
Duncan	McDonald	Tauzin
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	McKernan	Valentine
Erdreich	McNulty	Vander Jagt
Erlenborn	Michel	Vandergriff
Evans (IA)	Miller (OH)	Walker
Fiedler	Molinari	Weber
Fish	Mollohan	Whittaker
Franklin	Moore	Williams (OH)
Gekas	Moorhead	Winn
Gilman	Nowak	Wise
Gingrich	O'Brien	Wolf
Goodling	Olin	Wyllie
Gregg	Oxley	Yatron
Gunderson	Parris	Young (FL)
Hammerschmidt	Paul	Zschau
Hansen (ID)	Penny	

NOES—173

Ackerman	Bedell	Brooks
Akaka	Bellenson	Byron
Albosta	Boehert	Carper
Andrews (NC)	Boggs	Carr
Annuizio	Boner	Chappell
Anthony	Borski	Clarke
Applegate	Bosco	Coleman (MO)
Aspin	Boucher	Coleman (TX)
Barnes	Boxer	Coyne
Bateman	Breaux	Daschle
Bates	Britt	de la Garza

Dellums	Kennelly	Pickle
Dicks	Kildee	Porter
Dingell	LaFalce	Rahall
Donnelly	Lagomarsino	Rangel
Dorgan	Lantos	Reid
Dowdy	Lehman (CA)	Rodino
Downey	Leland	Roe
Dwyer	Levin	Rose
Dyson	Levitas	Rostenkowski
Early	Lewis (CA)	Rowland
Eckart	Livingston	Roybal
Edgar	Long (LA)	Savage
Edwards (CA)	Long (MD)	Sawyer
English	Lowry (WA)	Scheuer
Evans (IL)	Lukens	Schumer
Fascell	Lundine	Seiberling
Fazio	Markey	Sharp
Feighan	Matsui	Shelby
Ferraro	Mavroules	Simon
Flippo	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)
Foley	McCloskey	Smith (NJ)
Ford (MI)	McCurdy	Snyder
Ford (TN)	McDade	Solarz
Frank	McHugh	Spratt
Fuqua	Mikulski	Stark
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Studds
Gephardt	Mineta	Swift
Gibbons	Minish	Synar
Gonzalez	Mitchell	Taylor
Gray	Moakley	Thomas (GA)
Green	Moody	Towns
Guarini	Mrazek	Traxler
Hall, Ralph	Murphy	Udall
Hall, Sam	Murtha	Vento
Hamilton	Myers	Volkmer
Harrison	Natcher	Walgren
Hatcher	Neal	Waxman
Hefner	Oaker	Weaver
Hertel	Oberstar	Wheat
Horton	Obey	Whitley
Howard	Ortiz	Whitten
Hoyer	Ottinger	Wolpe
Jenkins	Owens	Wyden
Jones (NC)	Patman	Yates
Jones (OK)	Patterson	Young (MO)
Kaptur	Pease	Zablocki
Kastenmeier	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—125

Addabbo	Gore	Packard
Alexander	Gradison	Panetta
AuCoin	Gramm	Pashayan
Badham	Hall (IN)	Pepper
Berman	Hall (OH)	Price
Bevill	Hance	Pritchard
Biaggi	Hansen (UT)	Pursell
Boland	Harkin	Quillen
Bonior	Hawkins	Ratchford
Bonker	Heftel	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Hightower	Russo
Broyhill	Hillis	Sabo
Bryant	Holt	Schneider
Campbell	Huckaby	Schulze
Carney	Hutto	Shannon
Chandler	Ireland	Shaw
Chappie	Johnson	Shumway
Cheney	Jones (TN)	Shuster
Clay	Kazen	Sikorski
Coelho	Kolter	Siljander
Collins	Kostmayer	Sisisky
Conte	Leach	Skelton
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Slattery
Corcoran	Lent	Smith (FL)
Craig	Levine	Smith, Denny
Crockett	Lewis (FL)	St Germain
Derrick	Lipinski	Staggers
Dickinson	Lloyd	Stokes
Dixon	Lott	Stratton
Durbin	Marlenee	Torres
Dymally	Martin (NY)	Torricelli
Edwards (AL)	Martinez	Vucanovich
Fields	McCain	Watkins
Florio	McGrath	Weiss
Foglietta	McKinney	Whitehurst
Forsythe	Mica	Williams (MT)
Fowler	Montgomery	Wilson
Frenzel	Morrison (CT)	Wirth
Frost	Morrison (WA)	Wortley
Garcia	Nelson	Wright
Gaydos	Nichols	Young (AK)
Glickman	Nielson	

□ 1330

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Lewis of Florida for, with Mr. Boland against.

Mr. Corcoran for, with Mr. Nelson of Florida against.

Mr. Craig for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PARRIS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HILER

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), \$16,300,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of 222 staff employees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILER: On page 13, line 20, strike out "\$16,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,566,250".

□ 1340

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple amendment. I do not think it probably needs a lot of discussion and I will not take my full 5 minutes.

What this amendment would do would be to decrease the appropriation for the Congressional Budget Office from a 10-percent increase to a 5-percent increase in line with the kind of increase many other programs are having in our Government today.

In fiscal year 1983 the Congressional Budget Office had a 15.2-percent increase, and slated for 1984 would be a 10-percent increase. I see no reason why the CBO should have a 25.2-percent increase over a 2-year time period.

This amendment would reduce that amount from a 10-percent increase to a 5-percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, as has been the case with other amendments under discussion today, I think it is imperative that this body try to show some fiscal discipline. Certainly an area to start that, because we have not started today yet, would be the Congressional Budget Office, limiting them to a 5-percent increase as opposed to a 10-percent increase. I think it is entirely justified and should be supported by the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, likewise I will be brief, and I do not intend to take the entire time. I would like to make a couple of points.

First of all, we have again neglected to add in, I believe, the supplemental, so we are talking about apples and oranges when we talk about percentages. If you add in the supplemental, CBO requested an 11-percent increase. We gave them an 8-percent increase. This amendment would take it to 3 percent.

Let me make a comparison with two other very analogous agencies in the executive branch. The OMB asked us for a 20-percent increase. The Council of Economic Advisers asked for an 18-percent increase.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL) in the Treasury, Postal Service appropriation bill has given them increases below what they requested.

His bill provides the OMB 10.4 percent and the Council of Economic Advisers 13.2 percent.

We are now talking about the one agency that we have here in the Congress to deal with these two executive branch agencies and to analyze the entire Federal budget. This is a more modest increase than allowed the executive branch agencies. In recent years the Congressional Budget Office rate of increase has been less than that of the GAO, less than that of the Congressional Research Service, and less than that of the Office of Technology Assessment.

We have a new Director coming in, somebody who deserves a chance to do the job properly. I think we would be hurting our constituents and their interests in seeing us analyze the budget in order to make logical budget reductions if we do not give the CBO a reasonable funding level.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am sure this may come as no great surprise to my chairman, but since we do not know who the new CBO Director is going to be and since this is such a modest reduction I would urge my chairman to change his mind.

Why do we not just accept this one?

Mr. FAZIO. I am sorry that I have to disagree with my friend. I do not think we should hamper the legislative branch's ability to compete fairly with these agencies like the OMB and the Council of Economic Advisers.

I would urge that we defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 164, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—141

Albosta	Gregg	Oxley
Anderson	Gunderson	Packard
Andrews (TX)	Hall, Ralph	Parris
Applegate	Hall, Sam	Paul
Archer	Hammerschmidt	Petri
Barnard	Hansen (ID)	Pickle
Bartlett	Hartnett	Porter
Bateman	Hiler	Ray
Bennett	Hopkins	Regula
Bereuter	Hubbard	Ridge
Bethune	Hunter	Rinaldo
Billirakis	Hyde	Ritter
Bliley	Jacobs	Roberts
Boehlt	Jeffords	Robinson
Broomfield	Kasich	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Kemp	Roth
Broyhill	Kindness	Roukema
Burton	Kramer	Rudd
Byron	Lagomarsino	Schaefer
Clinger	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Coats	Leath	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Conable	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Coughlin	Loeffler	Smith, Robert
Courter	Lowery (CA)	Snowe
Crane, Daniel	Lujan	Snyder
Crane, Philip	Lungren	Solomon
Daniel	Mack	Spence
Dannemeyer	Madigan	Stangeland
Daub	Marriott	Stenholm
Davis	Martin (IL)	Stump
DeWine	Martin (NC)	Sundquist
Dreier	McCandless	Tauke
Duncan	McCollum	Taylor
Edwards (OK)	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	McDonald	Valentine
English	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Erlenborn	McKernan	Volkmer
Evans (IA)	Michel	Walker
Fiedler	Miller (OH)	Weber
Fish	Molinar	Whittaker
Franklin	Mollohan	Winn
Gekas	Moore	Wolf
Gilman	Moorhead	Wyllie
Gingrich	Myers	Yatron
Goodling	O'Brien	Young (FL)
Green	Olin	Zschau

NOES—164

Ackerman	Early	LaFalce
Akaka	Eckart	Lantos
Andrews (NC)	Edgar	Lehman (CA)
Annunzio	Edwards (CA)	Leland
Anthony	Erdreich	Levin
Aspin	Fascell	Levitas
Barnes	Fazio	Long (LA)
Bates	Feighan	Long (MD)
Bedell	Ferraro	Lowry (WA)
Bellenson	Flippo	Lukens
Boggs	Foley	Lundine
Boner	Ford (MI)	MacKay
Borski	Ford (TN)	Markey
Bosco	Frank	Matsui
Boucher	Fuqua	Mazzoli
Boxer	Gejdenson	McCloskey
Breaux	Gephardt	McCurdy
Britt	Gibbons	McHugh
Brooks	Gonzalez	McNulty
Carper	Gray	Mikulski
Carr	Guarini	Miller (CA)
Chappell	Hamilton	Mineta
Clarke	Harrison	Minish
Coleman (TX)	Hatcher	Mitchell
Cooper	Hefner	Moakley
Coyne	Hertel	Moody
Daschle	Horton	Mrazek
de la Garza	Howard	Murphy
Dellums	Hoyer	Murtha
Dicks	Hughes	Natcher
Dingell	Jenkins	Neal
Donnelly	Jones (NC)	Nowak
Dorgan	Jones (OK)	Oakar
Dowdy	Kastenmeier	Oberstar
Downey	Kennelly	Obey
Dwyer	Kildee	Ortiz
Dyson	Kogovsek	Otinger

Owens	Schroeder	Traxler
Patman	Schumer	Udall
Patterson	Seiberling	Vandergriff
Pease	Sharp	Vento
Penny	Shelby	Walgren
Perkins	Simon	Waxman
Rahall	Smith (IA)	Weaver
Rangel	Solarz	Wheat
Reld	Spratt	Whitley
Rodino	Stark	Whitten
Roe	Stokes	Williams (OH)
Roemer	Studds	Wise
Rose	Swift	Wolpe
Rostenkowski	Synar	Wyden
Rowland	Tallion	Yates
Roybal	Tauzin	Young (MO)
Savage	Thomas (GA)	Zablocki
Scheuer	Towns	

NOT VOTING—127

Addabbo	Gore	Nielson
Alexander	Gradison	Panetta
AuCoin	Gramm	Pashayan
Badham	Hall (IN)	Pepper
Berman	Hall (OH)	Price
Bevill	Hance	Pritchard
Blaggi	Hansen (UT)	Pursell
Boland	Harkin	Quillen
Bonior	Hawkins	Ratchford
Bonker	Heftel	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Hightower	Russo
Bryant	Hillis	Sabo
Campbell	Holt	Sawyer
Carney	Huckaby	Schneider
Chandler	Hutto	Schulze
Chapple	Ireland	Shannon
Cheney	Johnson	Shaw
Clay	Jones (TN)	Shumway
Coelho	Kaptur	Shuster
Collins	Kazen	Sikorski
Conte	Kolter	Siljander
Conyers	Kostmayer	Sisisky
Corcoran	Leach	Skelton
Craig	Lehman (FL)	Slattery
Crockett	Lent	Smith (FL)
D'Amours	Levine	Smith, Denny
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	St Germain
Dickinson	Lipinski	Staggers
Dixon	Lloyd	Stratton
Durbin	Lott	Torres
Dymally	Marlenee	Torricelli
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NY)	Vucanovich
Evans (IL)	Martinez	Watkins
Fields	Mavroules	Weiss
Florio	McCain	Whitehurst
Foglietta	McGrath	Williams (MT)
Forsythe	McKinney	Wilson
Fowler	Mica	Wirth
Frenzel	Montgomery	Wortley
Frost	Morrison (CT)	Wright
Garcia	Morrison (WA)	Young (AK)
Gaydos	Nelson	
Glickman	Nichols	

□ 1400

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Lewis of Florida for, with Mr. Sisisky against.

Mr. Corcoran for, with Mr. Nelson of Florida against.

Mr. Craig for, with Mr. Florio against.

Mr. GEJDENSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3135, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984.

Though I would have preferred to limit Members' office allowances to an increase of 5 percent and so voted on the amendment of the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. BARTLETT), nevertheless, I believe that the bill before the House is fiscally responsible at a level of \$1,210,644,200 (\$1.211 billion), which is \$16,691,000 below what was requested. Though the bill is over the level of funding appropriated to date for 1983, much of the increase is due to staff salaries, an area of continued congressional support. Notwithstanding the need to restrain the growth in new staff positions, the bill makes recommendations which will result in an overall reduction in staffing throughout the legislative branch of 18 positions under the authorized levels.

Both my colleague from California on the majority side, Mr. FAZIO, the Legislative Branch Subcommittee's able chairman, and my colleague from California on the minority side, Mr. LEWIS, the ever-diligent ranking minority member, deserve great praise for their work and contributions to this bill. They have done an exceptional job.

This year was my first to serve as a member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, and I have been very pleased to find that both Members run an efficient and responsible subcommittee. They are both outstanding leaders, and I am proud to be able to serve with them.

The bill they have guided is generally an excellent one, and I hope the Members will agree with me and vote accordingly.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress and the American people one additional issue relating to this legislative branch appropriation bill. That issue is the scandalous wage situation at Congress' printing plant, the Government Printing Office.

For the past 2 years, my subcommittee has considered an amendment to this bill which would require that GPO employees be paid no more than other Federal workers doing the same type jobs. Last year, the full committee narrowly defeated the amendment. This year, the bill moved through committee so rapidly that the amendment was not offered.

In the interest of expediting the consideration of this bill, I will not offer the amendment during this debate. The subcommittee, however, will hold hearings on this very important issue sometime later this month or early next. By that time, the General Accounting Office, which has been carefully studying this issue for some time, will have issued its report on the GPO wage scandal.

The GAO indicates, in their preliminary draft of the report the following astounding facts:

GPO craft and industrial employees were paid \$3,320 to \$17,879 more per year than General Schedule or Federal

al wage system employees in similar occupations. This means that GPO craft and industrial employees earn an average of 42 percent more than other Federal workers.

GPO craft employees also receive between \$0.36 and \$5.15 per hour more than private sector employees doing the same work.

Over the last 10 years, GPO wage increases for these workers have greatly exceeded wage increases granted other Federal workers.

Many different unrelated jobs, requiring different training and skill levels, are all paid at the same rate, completely disregarding the standard practice in the Federal Government.

Once the GAO issues its final report, the subcommittee will thoroughly explore this longstanding scandal. The present situation cannot continue. The Congress must get its own house in order if we are to preach budgetary discipline to the rest of the Government.

The American taxpayers will no longer countenance this disgraceful waste of their money. Later in this session, after the subcommittee hearing, Congress must deal with this issue. Legislation must be introduced this term to eventually bring the wages of GPO employees into line with the wages paid other Federal workers. I urge you to support that legislation when it is introduced.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House Office Buildings, including the position of Superintendent of Garages as authorized by law, \$21,361,000, of which \$392,000 shall remain available until expended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 15, line 19, strike "\$21,361,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,191,124".

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the committee has been patient in receiving amendments and giving them a fair hearing. I will try to make the presentation of this one as brief as possible.

This amendment is offered to eliminate 14 elevator positions for people who operate automatic elevators. Currently there are 44 elevator operators operating automatic elevators on the Hill; 15 are on the Senate side, 15 are on the House side in the Capitol Building, and 14 are in the House office buildings. The amount of money that is deleted here deletes the funding for those elevator operators who operate elevators in the House office buildings. It is a move that is similar to the move

taken by the U.S. Senate over a year ago. They eliminated the money for operators to operate automatic elevators in their office buildings.

It does retain 15 elevator operators in the Capitol Building itself. It saves this country over \$169,000. I think it sets the right kind of example. It does provide jobs for those senior operators who would want to come and take the remaining positions in this building.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this. I must say the elevator operators in my office building are fine people and I enjoy them. I enjoy talking to them and observing them at work, but I have noticed invariably the operated elevators are slower than the self-operated elevators which do not have operators in them.

I do believe that we would speed up the work of this body somewhat if we were to eliminate the pleasant chats that we all have these elevator operators coming and going.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would merely urge the committee to approve this amendment. It gives us an opportunity to eliminate waste and abuse in our own operation. I think that sets the right kind of example for our country that so desperately wants that deficit reduced.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

□ 1410

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. In the last 6 years, how many elevator operators has the House eliminated?

Mr. FAZIO. We started with 152. We are now down to 44. We have been, through attrition, eliminating many of these positions as part of our normal appropriations process, and we will continue to eliminate nonessential positions.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is a shame that we have to discuss this issue here on the Floor. But the problem is that it is kind of tough to talk back home, explain back home, why you have operators who operate automatic elevators, particularly when I have constituents come in, and they have difficulty un-

derstanding why operators seem to be engaged with personal conversations during the entire time, and you are sometimes embarrassed to get on the elevator because you think you are breaking in on a telephone conversation. It just seems to me that we ought to take ourselves more seriously about this. It is a shame that it has to come up in this form, but we ought to at least concern ourselves with the image that is created for our constituents who happen to visit this Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 101, noes 193, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—101

Anderson	Hartnett	Regula
Archer	Hiler	Ridge
Barnard	Hopkins	Ritter
Bartlett	Hubbard	Roberts
Bateman	Hunter	Robinson
Bennett	Kasich	Roemer
Bethune	Kogovsek	Rogers
Bilirakis	Kramer	Roth
Billiey	Lagomarsino	Schaefer
Boehlert	Latta	Schroeder
Borski	Leath	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CO)	Loeffler	Skeen
Broyhill	Lujan	Smith (NE)
Burton	Lungren	Smith, Robert
Coats	Mack	Snyder
Coleman (MO)	Madigan	Solomon
Conable	Martin (IL)	Spratt
Courter	Martin (NC)	Stenholm
Crane, Daniel	McCandless	Stump
Crane, Philip	McDonald	Sundquist
Dannemeyer	McEwen	Tauke
Daub	Michel	Tauzin
DeWine	Miller (OH)	Thomas (CA)
Dreier	Molinari	Valentine
Edwards (OK)	Moore	Vander Jagt
Emerson	Moorhead	Walker
Erlenborn	Olin	Weber
Evans (IA)	Oxley	Whittaker
Gekas	Packard	Winn
Gibbons	Parris	Wolf
Gilman	Paul	Wylie
Gingrich	Pease	Young (FL)
Gregg	Petri	Zschau
Hall, Ralph	Ray	

NOES—193

Ackerman	Carper	Edwards (CA)
Akaka	Carr	English
Andrews (NC)	Chappell	Erdreich
Annunzio	Clarke	Fasell
Anthony	Clinger	Fazio
Applegate	Coleman (TX)	Feighan
Aspin	Cooper	Ferraro
Barnes	Coughlin	Fiedler
Bates	Coyne	Fish
Bedell	Daniel	Flippo
Bellenson	Daschle	Foley
Bereuter	Davis	Ford (MI)
Boggs	de la Garza	Ford (TN)
Boner	Dicks	Frank
Bosco	Donnelly	Franklin
Boucher	Dorgan	Fuqua
Boxer	Dowdy	Gejdenson
Breaux	Downey	Gephardt
Britt	Dwyer	Gonzalez
Brooks	Dyson	Goodling
Broomfield	Eckart	Gray
Byron	Edgar	Green

Guarini	McCollum	Rowland
Gunderson	McCurdy	Roybal
Hall, Sam	McDade	Rudd
Hamilton	McHugh	Savage
Hammerschmidt	McKernan	Sawyer
Harrison	McNulty	Scheuer
Hatcher	Mikulski	Schumer
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Seiberling
Hertel	Mineta	Sharp
Horton	Minish	Shelby
Hoyer	Mitchell	Simon
Hyde	Moakley	Smith (IA)
Jacobs	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Jeffords	Moody	Solarz
Jenkins	Mrazek	Spence
Jones (NC)	Murphy	Stangeland
Jones (OK)	Murtha	Stark
Kaptur	Myers	Stokes
Kastenmeier	Natcher	Swift
Kemp	Neal	Synar
Kennelly	Nowak	Tallon
Kildee	O'Brien	Taylor
Kindness	Oakar	Thomas (GA)
Lantos	Oberstar	Towns
Lehman (CA)	Obey	Udall
Lehman (FL)	Ortiz	Vandergriff
Leland	Ottlinger	Vento
Levin	Owens	Volkmer
Levitas	Patman	Walgren
Lewis (CA)	Patterson	Waxman
Livingston	Penny	Weaver
Long (LA)	Perkins	Wheat
Long (MD)	Pickle	Whitley
Lowery (CA)	Porter	Whitten
Lowry (WA)	Rahall	Williams (OH)
Luken	Rangel	Wise
Lundine	Reid	Wyden
MacKay	Rinaldo	Yates
Markey	Rodino	Yatron
Marriott	Roe	Young (MO)
Matsui	Rostenkowski	Zablocki
Mazzoli	Roukema	
McCloskey		

NOT VOTING—138

Addabbo	Garcia	Nelson
Albosta	Gaydos	Nichols
Alexander	Glickman	Nielson
Andrews (TX)	Gore	Panetta
AuCoin	Gradison	Pashayan
Badham	Gramm	Pepper
Berman	Hall (IN)	Price
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Pritchard
Biaggi	Hance	Pursell
Boland	Hansen (ID)	Quillen
Bonior	Hansen (UT)	Ratchford
Bonker	Harkin	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Hawkins	Russo
Bryant	Heftel	Sabo
Campbell	Hightower	Schneider
Carney	Hillis	Schulze
Chandler	Holt	Shannon
Chapple	Howard	Shaw
Cheney	Huckaby	Shumway
Clay	Hughes	Shuster
Coelho	Hutto	Sikorski
Collins	Ireland	Siljander
Conte	Johnson	Sisisky
Conyers	Jones (TN)	Skelton
Corcoran	Kazen	Slattery
Craig	Kolter	Smith (FL)
Crockett	Kostmayer	Smith, Denny
D'Amours	LaFalce	Snowe
Dellums	Leach	St Germain
Derrick	Lent	Staggers
Dickinson	Levine	Stratton
Dingell	Lewis (FL)	Studds
Dixon	Lipinski	Torres
Duncan	Lloyd	Torricelli
Durbin	Lott	Traxler
Dymally	Marlenee	Vucanovich
Early	Martin (NY)	Watkins
Edwards (AL)	Martinez	Weiss
Evans (IL)	Mavroules	Whitehurst
Fields	McCain	Williams (MT)
Florio	McGrath	Wilson
Foglietta	McKianey	Wirth
Forsythe	Mica	Wolpe
Fowler	Montgomery	Wortley
Frenzel	Morrison (CT)	Wright
Frost	Morrison (WA)	Young (AK)

□ 1420

Mr. MacKAY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 3135, the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1984. I am sad to say that H.R. 3135 is another example of Congress unwillingness to make the hard decisions necessary to bring the budget deficit in line. This is not the time to call for growth in the legislative branch to expand our committee staff and support offices.

While I oppose H.R. 3135, I do support one provision in the bill. And that provision is to cap Members of Congress salary. After the charade of the 97th Congress over increases in Members pay, I am pleased we will not be playing that kind of game again.

However, this one measure of self-restraint is not enough to regain the confidence of the taxpayers. Congress is going to have to pull in its belt. An increase in our own appropriations is simply not justified and therefore I must oppose this bill.●

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments in order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, since there are no other amendments, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3135) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 104, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—184

Ackerman	Guarini	Patman
Akaka	Hamilton	Patterson
Anderson	Harrison	Pease
Andrews (NC)	Hatcher	Penny
Annunzio	Hefner	Perkins
Anthony	Hertel	Pickle
Aspin	Horton	Porter
Barnard	Hoyer	Rahall
Barnes	Hughes	Rangel
Bates	Hyde	Regula
Bedell	Jeffords	Reid
Beilenson	Jenkins	Ridge
Boggs	Jones (NC)	Rinaldo
Boner	Jones (OK)	Robinson
Borski	Kaptur	Rodino
Bosco	Kastenmeier	Roe
Boucher	Kennelly	Rowland
Boxer	Kildee	Roybal
Breaux	Kogovsek	Rudd
Britt	Lantos	Savage
Brooks	Lehman (CA)	Sawyer
Carper	Lehman (FL)	Scheuer
Carr	Leland	Schumer
Chappell	Levin	Seiberling
Clarke	Levitas	Shelby
Coleman (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Simon
Cooper	Long (LA)	Smith (IA)
Coyne	Long (MD)	Smith (NE)
Daschle	Lowry (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Davis	Luken	Snyder
de la Garza	Lundine	Solarz
Dellums	MacKay	Spratt
Dicks	Madigan	Stangeland
Dingell	Markey	Stark
Donnelly	Marriott	Stokes
Dorgan	Matsui	Swift
Dowdy	Mazzoli	Synar
Downey	McCloskey	Tallon
Duncan	McCurdy	Taylor
Dwyer	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Early	McNulty	Thomas (GA)
Eckart	Michel	Towns
Edgar	Miller (CA)	Udall
Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Vander Jagt
English	Minish	Vandergriff
Erlenborn	Mitchell	Vento
Fascell	Moakley	Volkmer
Fazio	Molinari	Walgren
Feighan	Mollohan	Waxman
Ferraro	Mrázek	Weaver
Fish	Murtha	Wheat
Foley	Myers	Whitten
Ford (MI)	Natcher	Williams (OH)
Frank	Neal	Wolf
Fuqua	Nowak	Wyden
Gejdenson	O'Brien	Yates
Gephardt	Oakar	Yatron
Gibbons	Oberstar	Young (MO)
Gilman	Obey	Zablocki
Gonzalez	Ortiz	Zschau
Gray	Ottenger	
Green	Owens	

NAYS—104

Applegate	Courter	Hall, Ralph
Archer	Crane, Daniel	Hall, Sam
Bartlett	Crane, Philip	Hammerschmidt
Bateman	Daniel	Hansen (ID)
Bennett	Dannemeyer	Hartnett
Bereuter	Daub	Hubbard
Bethune	DeWine	Hunter
Billrakis	Dreier	Jacobs
Bliley	Dyson	Kasich
Boehlert	Edwards (OK)	Kemp
Broomfield	Emerson	Kindness
Brown (CO)	Evans (IA)	Kramer
Broyhill	Fiedler	Lagomarsino
Burton	Flippo	Leath
Byron	Franklin	Livingston
Clinger	Gekas	Loeffler
Coats	Gingrich	Lowery (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Goodling	Lujan
Conable	Gregg	Lungren
Coughlin	Gunderson	Mack

Martin (IL)	Petri	Spence
Martin (NC)	Ray	Stenholm
McCandless	Ritter	Stump
McCollum	Roberts	Sundquist
McDonald	Roemer	Tauke
McEwen	Rogers	Tauzin
Miller (OH)	Roth	Valentine
Moore	Roukema	Walker
Moorhead	Schaefer	Weber
Murphy	Schroeder	Whittaker
Olin	Sensenbrenner	Winn
Oxley	Sharp	Wise
Packard	Skeen	Wylie
Parris	Smith, Robert	Young (FL)
Paul	Solomon	

NOT VOTING—144

Addabbo	Gradison	Nichols
Albosta	Gramm	Nielson
Alexander	Hall (IN)	Panetta
Andrews (TX)	Hall (OH)	Pashayan
AuCoin	Hance	Pepper
Badham	Hansen (UT)	Price
Berman	Harkin	Pritchard
Bevill	Hawkins	Pursell
Biaggi	Heftel	Quillen
Boland	Hightower	Ratchford
Bonior	Hiller	Richardson
Bonker	Hillis	Rose
Brown (CA)	Holt	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Hopkins	Russo
Campbell	Howard	Sabo
Carney	Huckaby	Schneider
Chandler	Hutto	Schulze
Chapple	Ireland	Shannon
Cheney	Johnson	Shaw
Clay	Jones (TN)	Shumway
Coelho	Kazen	Shuster
Collins	Kolter	Sikorski
Conte	Kostmayer	Siljander
Conyers	LaFalce	Sisisky
Corcoran	Latta	Skelton
Craig	Leach	Slatery
Crockett	Lent	Smith (FL)
D'Amours	Levine	Smith, Denny
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	Snowe
Dickinson	Lipinski	St Germain
Dixon	Lloyd	Staggers
Durbin	Lott	Stratton
Dymally	Marlenee	Studds
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NY)	Torres
Erdreich	Martinez	Torricelli
Evans (IL)	Mavroules	Traxler
Fields	McCain	Vucanovich
Florio	McGrath	Watkins
Foglietta	McHugh	Weiss
Ford (TN)	McKernan	Whitehurst
Forsythe	McKinney	Whitley
Fowler	Mica	Williams (MT)
Frenzel	Mikulski	Wilson
Frost	Montgomery	Wirth
Garcia	Moody	Wolpe
Gaydos	Morrison (CT)	Wortley
Glickman	Morrison (WA)	Wright
Gore	Nelson	Young (AK)

□ 1440

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Erdreich against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Nichols against.

Mr. Morrison of Connecticut for, with Mr. Lewis of Florida against.

Mr. Nelson of Florida for, with Mr. Denny Smith against.

Mr. Florio for, with Mr. Shaw against.

Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. Badham against.

Mr. Durbin for, with Mr. Carney against.

Mr. Garcia for, with Mr. Latta against.

Mrs. Hall of Indiana for, with Mr. Shuster against.

Mr. Ratchford for, with Mr. McCain against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Nielson of Utah against.

Mr. Dixon for, with Mr. Pashayan against.

Mr. Sisisky for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Derrick for, with Mr. Hiler against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Gramm against.
Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Frenzel against.
Mr. Bonker for, with Mr. Chapple against.
Mr. Smith of Florida for, with Mr. Campbell against.

Mr. Mica for, with Mr. Corcoran against.
Mr. Evans of Illinois for, with Mr. Craig against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Siljander against.

Mr. Wortley for, with Mr. Cheney against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 3223, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

Mr. WHITTEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-231) on the bill (H.R. 3223) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska reserved all points of order on the bill.

REPORT ON H.R. 3222, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-232) on the bill (H.R. 3222) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio reserved all points of order on the bill.

CAPITOL HILL ELEVATOR OPERATORS

(Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in the 5 months I have been here I have found the elevator operators in the House of Representatives to be unfailingly courteous and helpful. I very much regret that the opportunity was taken this afternoon to bring an amendment on the floor which would have eliminated funding for their salaries, and I was happy for the opportunity to vote against it.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 953

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be deleted from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 953, as introduced by Mr. BIAGGI on January 26, 1983. My name was entered on May 12, 1983.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONNELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSION OF SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3074 and H.R. 3045, which would establish a temporary moratorium on the continuing disability investigations in the social security disability insurance (SSDI) and supplemental security income (SSI) programs. This moratorium would remain in effect until comprehensive reforms in the review system have been implemented.

The tragedy of the SSDI and SSI review processes has been well documented. A recent report by the General Accounting Office, requested by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, shows that many Americans have been unjustly denied social security disability benefits due to an overburdened and inadequate review process. An article in the New York Times published April 7, 1983 also focused national attention on this problem.

The current situation began in 1980, when legislation was enacted requiring the review of all claims for persons receiving disability insurance on a regular basis. This new review process began in April 1981. As a result of this law, increased burdens have been placed upon the States' review processes. Consequently, many deserving individuals have had their disability benefits terminated.

Numerous statements from treating physicians, State program administrators, and patients exemplify the inappropriate determination process. These sources state that physicians, who are not members of the community and who have never before seen the patients involved, examine these patients under contract with administering agency. The examinations often last only 5 minutes, and inappropriate diagnoses are made. One of my constituents tells of X-rays obtained in one such exam which did not show the site of the patient's disability. A report is then rendered based upon these examinations, and benefits may be terminated as a result. I find this type of hasty review process unconscionable.

The findings of the General Accounting Office report truly reflect a national problem. As one GAO official pointed out, all States use guidelines and instructions furnished by the Social Security Administration in conducting disability review. Even more disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the GAO conducted parts of its study in my own State of Ohio. I have received several letters from constituents describing heart-rending stories of how they have been improperly terminated from disability benefits. I would like to share with my colleagues an excerpt from a letter I received from a treating physician in my district describing the terrible misdiagnoses being made under the current review process. What follows are vivid examples of the wrongful termination of disability benefits:

A 58-year-old woman with rheumatoid arthritis with red, angry, swollen joints requiring gold salt therapy, high dosage aspirin, and who has had surgical implantation of plastic knuckles to enable her to perform the minimum daily activities of life;

A 43-year-old mother of two dependent children, divorced, has had rheumatoid vasculitis with severe impairment of the nervous system affecting the upper and lower limbs since she was 32. She has had continuing rheumatoid disease with the inability to bear weight for any prolonged period, because of ankle involvement. In addition, she has had nearly total loss of motion in her wrists. At her disability assessment, a hip X-ray was obtained. The hip was never involved in her condition. She was denied benefits; and

A 58-year-old male who was injured and has such muscle spasms that on forward-bending his spine lists to the side has been under treatment for 3 to 5 years. This individual was on social security disability insurance, was denied his claim, and asked to pay back \$6,000. The examination itself so upset this patient that his psoriasis flared up and became an additional source of disability.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that determining an individual's eligibility for disability benefits is a very complex and delicate task. Furthermore, no Federal program serving so many people can be administered completely without error. Yet, this does not justify the inadequacy of the present review process. As a caring society, we cannot allow disabled patients, such as those in the examples just given, to be callously cut off from proper medical assistance.

Every day, disabled Americans are forfeiting their homes, cars, and other personal belongings in order to obtain adequate medical coverage. Many of those who have been terminated from their benefits deteriorate quickly, both physically and mentally, and some have even died because they

could not afford the care and services they needed.

I urge my colleagues to take immediate action to develop a comprehensive solution that will insure that patients who are in need of assistance receive the disability benefits to which they are entitled. Until such reforms are enacted, a moratorium on the present eligibility review process is required. I support the approach contained in H.R. 3045 and H.R. 3074 because it would not repeal the 1980 legislation mandating the expanded review process. I believe we are all agreed that disability and SSI claims must be reviewed regularly. But H.R. 3045 and H.R. 3074 would allow sufficient time to analyze the problems within the process, and to receive and develop specific recommendations for legislative action to improve the process.

Our society cannot continue to risk the lives of its people due to the inappropriate procedures for determining eligibility for benefits. Not even one life should be threatened in this process. I urge my colleagues to temporarily suspend the review process by joining me in supporting H.R. 3045 and H.R. 3074.

□ 1450

INTO THE ABYSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan is preparing the way for a United States leap into the abyss of El Salvador. At the same time he is running an ever-greater risk to American Forces in Lebanon.

In El Salvador, he has dismissed his Ambassador in the most brutal way possible—not because the Ambassador failed to support administration policy, but because he had the temerity to suggest that the Government of El Salvador might do well to curb its murder squads. In the words of one commentator, this sacking of Ambassador Hinton can only be interpreted "as a signal of the priority Reagan attaches to improvements in human rights." In other words, the administration is telling the right wingers in El Salvador that they should not worry about murder as usual; it does not concern the Americans. And indeed, within hours of the Ambassador's unseemly and demeaning firing, the right wingers in El Salvador moved to strengthen their position.

Meanwhile, back in Washington, the President fired Thomas Enders, the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America. Not because Enders was insufficiently tough, but because he tried to work out agreements with Congress. The President is saying that he cares not an ounce about any con-

gressional concerns over his policy; he is betting that he can cajole or frighten a majority into acquiescing with anything that he cares to do.

What these moves amount to is a takeover of Latin American policy by the White House. Henceforth, that policy will not be run by people who necessarily know anything about Latin America—indeed, Secretary Enders will be replaced by an ex-land developer from Alaska. Real control of policy in El Salvador and elsewhere will rest in the hands of the national security adviser, William Clark, who has been described as having the "Reagan psyche" as his "area of expertise."

Now that Reagan has made it clear that he does not expect the Government of El Salvador to do the one thing that might give it legitimacy—carry out reforms, institute law, order, and some semblance of justice—he is moving to the next phase, which is of course a much deeper involvement in El Salvador and elsewhere.

Today's New York Times details how the administration is "convinced that U.S. military presence in Central America is too small" and that "an increase in American involvement" is being considered. The report goes on to say that the President has reviewed a plan "to expand U.S. military activity in Honduras," significantly above present plans to use 100 U.S. advisers to train Salvadoran troops there. In fact, the Honduran base is simply a subterfuge, to allow a great expansion of U.S. military training for Salvadoran troops, while allowing the administration to claim that the number of Americans committed to the abyss of El Salvador is smaller than it really is. Nor is that the end of it; additional American Forces are involved in the training of Salvadoran officers, here in U.S. Army facilities.

It is plain that the administration will increase the level of U.S. commitment with every setback on the Salvadoran Government. It is inching toward a commitment of U.S. troops in a combat role. This surely is no different from the sad history of Vietnam, where we spent endless blood and money in behalf of a corrupt government, just as the President is now committing more and more to El Salvador, a government characterized yesterday by former President Carter as "the most murderous in this hemisphere." Reagan, far from calling for reform in El Salvador, is discouraging it—and yet, political oppression, extreme poverty, and incredible injustice are the fuel behind the rebellion he hopes to quell. He tells these thugs in El Salvador that they will get all the help they want or need, and proves it by dispatching more Americans to El Salvador to provide military medical help, and more Americans to Honduras to provide more training, and at the same time dismissing anyone in

his own administration who counsels the slightest bit of moderation or caution—even those who only suggest that the Salvadorans should not be quite so open about their murder spree.

We in Congress ought to be concerned about this. We ought to be outraged. But there is a nervous silence. What good does it do to keep in power a government that is as squalid as any in the world? It only puts off the day of reckoning, and equates us with mobsters and monsters who govern by fear and terror, rather than decency and justice. Have we forgotten the anguished warnings of Stilwell, in wartime China, who was frustrated by the endless corruption of the so-called ally we supported? Have we so soon forgotten the fate of Somoza, who enjoyed decades of endless help from the United States? Have we forgotten the disaster of Iran, where we ignored the cries of decent and moderate people, who knew that the Shah could not last, no matter how great his apparatus of terror was? Have we forgotten Vietnam, where no amount of blood and treasure could save a government that had no legitimacy, sought none, and cared not? Have we learned nothing? Not if we stand silent and idle while the administration prepares to carry out a policy that is more extreme every day, and more costly with each passing hour, and less promising each minute.

Even as we plunge into the abyss of El Salvador, we are being drawn into a daily more unstable and dangerous situation in Lebanon. Has anyone failed to see the expanded French commitment in Beirut? Does anyone forget that we have now been informed that our marines will be in Lebanon for at least another 15 months? Does not anyone know that additional marines will be sent there, and that they will come more and more into the line of fire by the forces that hope to ignite one more war? Does not anyone realize that the most extreme elements of the Palestine Liberation Army are gaining in their efforts to wrest control from Arafat, who is not bloodthirsty enough to suit them?

How many in the House today know that there are secret agreements to which the United States is party, in connection with the Lebanon-Israel agreement signed a few days ago? How many of us know the contents of those agreements? How many of us have evaluated the risk, considered the extent of our commitment?

If ever there were a time for the Congress to ask hard questions and demand hard answers, it is now. The administration is inching toward an outright war in Central America; as matters are now going, it is only a question of time.

This is a situation in which the war powers resolution might well apply.

Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs maintains that President Reagan has been skirting the resolution, with respect to Lebanon, and I include in the RECORD his letter to me stating that fact.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1983.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: Thank you for your lengthy and thoughtful letter of May 17 regarding the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate your insightful comments on this important matter.

At the outset, let me thank you for your kind comments regarding my role in connection with the enactment of the War Powers Resolution. I regard it as one of the most important legislative achievements of my Congressional career and do indeed exercise oversight with constant and determined effort. In that connection, your letter was an important prod and inspiration for me to continue to do so.

As to the case in point regarding U.S. Marines deployed in Lebanon on September 29, 1982, let me make the following points:

I completely concur in your view that the President failed to fully and properly comply with the War Powers Resolution. My position on that question was made clear in public statements of September 29 and 30, 1982. My more detailed comments were expressed in my Washington Post article of October 3, 1982. Copies of all three items are enclosed.

In various hearings and other fora since September 29, 1982, I have questioned Administration representatives on the issue, and also directed the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee to follow all developments on the matter.

In the course of considering and marking up H.R. 2532, the Lebanon Emergency Assistance Act of 1983, I worked closely with Representative Lee H. Hamilton, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, in having the following language inserted in the bill:

"Sec. 4. The President shall obtain statutory authorization from the Congress with respect to the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into Lebanon in conjunction with agreements providing for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon and for the creation of a new, more permanent multinational peace-keeping force in Lebanon."

A somewhat different version of that language appears in the Senate counterpart bill, S. 639. A compromise version of the difference has been worked out and the bill is tentatively scheduled to be considered on the House floor on June 1.

Aside from these specific efforts there is another, somewhat more general but fundamental, consideration that guides me in my oversight of War Powers. That thought was expressed in my October 3 Post article but bears repeating here.

Basically, I believe that a responsible Congressional oversight effort must be both vigilant and prudent. We must not see "hostilities" around every corner. To do so would wear the War Powers Resolution threadbare and end up making it meaningless through excessive application. Under such circumstances the law would be made sterile and be ineffective when we need it the most.

On the other hand, and as you say so well, simple inconsistency or inaction by Congress would vitiate the Resolution beyond repair.

Obviously these alternatives present a dilemma as well as a delicate challenge of determined but common sense oversight.

With your continuing help and guidance, I intend to do that.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

CLEM,
Chairman.

Chairman ZABLOCKI warns of danger, and says that his concerns have led him to include restrictive language in the latest aid authorizations for Lebanon; and I commend him for that concern. Yet I fear that more must be done, both with regard to Lebanon and Central America, if we are going to avoid tragedy.

Chairman ZABLOCKI is concerned that we cannot raise the war powers resolution unless there is a clear and present danger, saying that "We must not see 'hostilities' around every corner." I certainly agree on that point. But looking at Central America, surely all the signs are there. The change of personnel, the clear takeover of policy by amateurs who have absolutely no background, the sudden news of new options being considered, the commitment of new troops to that handy base in Honduras, the talk of added commitments of advisers in El Salvador itself—all of this and more, suggests that Reagan is ready for war, and is waiting only for the excuse.

When do we raise the war powers resolution? After the 1st, the 50th, or the 14th adviser is killed? Do we raise it on the basis of the 50th, the 500th or the 5,000th so-called adviser sent into the area?

The intent of the resolution is to prevent unilateral Presidential actions, little wars like the secret war in Cambodia. The idea and purpose of the resolution is to insure that Congress plays its constitutional role in the question of when, where, and whether to go to war. But the administration has no intention of involving Congress in any of its decisions. It was precisely because Secretary Enders made some efforts in that direction that he was fired, to be replaced by a nonprofessional, political appointee who may be familiar with Alaska, but who can be trusted never to tell Ronald Reagan what he does not care to hear. In that circumstance, and in the situation where the President clearly aims to deepen our involvement in a very dangerous situation, is it not time to act? When all the preparations for war are in train, that is when Congress ought to be most alert. It is too late once the trap has sprung.

It is inconceivable to me that one of the most odious governments on Earth is deserving of a single dime of American money, much less the commitment of a single American life. There is no

way that the Government of El Salvador is ever going to be legitimized by our money or the blood of our children. There is no way that we can abandon reason in the face of all the evidence that the Government of El Salvador created its own rebellion, that it has no intention of ever providing law or justice or decency to its impoverished people; that with each day it becomes weaker through its own viciousness. Where is the notion that there is a place for moral judgment? How can we justify acting in behalf of what former President Carter—and he should know—calls one of the most murderous of all governments?

Now is the time to stay the hand of the President—before, not after, he leads us over the abyss, and our children with him.●

HONORING JOHN CHAMBERLIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to Congress I decided that it was critically important that I have on my staff someone who was a senior citizen. I made this decision because I felt that only by looking through the eyes of an older person could one really understand the issues and effects of our policies on the aging. Therefore, I was extremely lucky to have persuaded John Chamberlin to come out of his retirement and join my staff. He has proved to be an able adviser and his wit and genial manner have won many friends in the Fifth Congressional District.

On May 23 of this year, Mr. Chamberlin reached his 75th birthday, and, much to my misfortune, announced that he would be leaving my staff to rejoin his lovely wife Helen in their leisurely pursuit of life. It is with regret that I see him go and I wish to honor him here today for his service to the constituents of my district.

John is a long-time resident of Laurel, Md. He is retired from an engineering career at Vitro Laboratories in Silver Spring and is a life member of the American Defense Preparedness Association and a charter member of the Society of American Value Engineers. Before joining my staff, John served as marketing director for the Laurel Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chamberlin has been active in community and church affairs and in civic and fraternal circles for many years. He is affiliated with the American Association of Retired Persons, both national and local chapters. He is a member and past president of the Laurel Rotary Club; past master of the Laurel Wreath Masonic Lodge No. 149, A.F. and A.M.; member of the York and Scottish Rite bodies and Boumi Shrine Temple, Baltimore;

member of Laurel Lodge No. 155, Knights of Pythias; and is a trustee and administrative board member of the Laurel First United Methodist Church. Chamberlin also serves on the board of directors of the Heart Association of Southern Maryland, is a director of the sponsoring body of the Oasis Youth Services Bureau at Laurel, and is a member of the Agricultural Land Preservation Advisory Board of Prince Georges County.

Needless to say, he is a very busy man and his influence and dedication to his fellow citizens is far reaching and great. Through his activity as community affairs liaison, John Chamberlin has aided many hundreds of residents, answering questions on everything from health care and social security to housing and economic aid. He has visited countless senior citizens groups at local county and community senior citizen centers, clubs, and agencies and has, in the process, elevated the community consciousness as to the availability of numerous services offered to seniors in our area at all levels of government.

And throughout all his activity, he has brought a sparkling wit, shining good humor, and a keen sensitivity which will long be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that a man of the caliber of John Chamberlin has been a member of my staff, and I wish him and Helen all the best for their future happiness.●

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON 1983 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am submitting to the RECORD a letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending and revenues for fiscal year 1983.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1983.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending. Pursuant to Committee Rule 10, I am herewith transmitting the status report under S. Con. Res. 92, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1983. This report reflects the resolution of June 24, 1982, and the current CBO estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues based on all completed action on spending and revenue measures

as of the close of legislative business May 26, 1983.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JAMES R. JONES, *Chairman.*

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1983 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, ADOPTED IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 92, REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MAY 26, 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level.....	822,390	769,818	665,900
Current level.....	861,866	802,912	606,311
Amount over resolution.....	39,476	33,094	
Amount under resolution.....			59,589

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal year 1983, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in Senate Concurrent Resolution 92 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal year 1983, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in Senate Concurrent Resolution 92 to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss for fiscal year 1983, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in Senate Concurrent Resolution 92.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1983.

HON. JAMES R. JONES,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that the estimates of the current level of 1983 budget authority, outlays, and revenues sent to you on April 6, 1983, have changed because the Congress has cleared S. Con. Res. 26 approving funds for the MX missile. The current estimates consistent with CBO's current economic and estimating assumption are:

[Millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Current level estimate.....	861,866	802,912	606,311
Budget Resolution, S. Con. Res. 92.....	822,390	769,818	665,900
Amount over (+)/under (-) resolution.....	+ 39,476	+ 33,094	- 59,579

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN, *Director.*

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1983 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 31, 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
I. Enacted:		
Permanent appropriations and trust funds.....	473,430	465,643
Enacted previous session.....	482,803	465,668
Offsetting receipts.....	-132,721	-132,733
Enacted this session:		
Economic Development Administration deferral disapproval, H. Res. 74.....		5
DGE strategic petroleum reserve deferral disapproval, H. Res. 80.....		6
Supplemental jobs bill, Public Law 98-8.....	15,736	7,336
Offsetting receipts.....	-5,159	-5,159
Social Security Act Amendments of 1983, Public Law 98-21.....	26,610	731
Total enacted.....	860,699	801,499
II. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation:		
Medicaid.....	101	101
Federal unemployment benefits and allowances.....	70	70
Advances to unemployment insurance trust fund.....	2,275	2,275
Offsetting receipts.....	-2,275	-2,275
Payment to Civil Service retirement trust fund.....	342	342
Offsetting receipts.....	-342	-342
Civilian agency pay raises.....	791	902
Black lung disability trust fund.....	54	54
Mass transportation capital fund.....		85
Federal disability insurance trust fund.....	220	220
Offsetting receipts.....	-220	-220
Payment to social security trust fund.....	1,180	1,180
Offsetting receipts.....	-1,180	-1,180
Supplemental security income.....	151	151
Total.....	1,167	1,363
III. Continuing resolution authority.....		
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses:		
MX missile approval, S. Con. Res. 26.....		50
Total, current level as of May 31, 1983.....	861,866	802,912
Second Budget Resolution, S. Con. Res. 92.....	822,390	769,818
Amount remaining:		
Over ceiling.....	39,476	33,094
Under ceiling.....		

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS of Florida (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), from June 1 to June 6, on account of official business.

Mr. WIRTH (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. CARNEY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today though June 7, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, on June 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. OBEY, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,690.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANKLIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. RUDD.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in 10 instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEASE.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. FAZIO in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. RATCHFORD.

Mr. MICA.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. McDONALD.

Mr. WAXMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 6, 1983, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1290. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report on expenditures of appropriations for the period October 1, 1982, through March 31, 1983, pursuant to section 105(b) of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1291. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Retirement Board, transmitting the third annual report of the District of Columbia Retirement Board, pursuant to section 164 of Public Law 96-122; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1292. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed regulations concerning collecting agents and joint fundraising activities, pursuant to sec-

tion 438(d)(1), of title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

1293. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting notice of proposed construction of NASA research and development facilities exceeding \$250,000, for installation of support facilities, site 1, Air Force Plant 42, Palmade, Calif., pursuant to section 101(d) of Public Law 97-324; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 419. An act to provide that per capita payments to Indians may be made by tribal governments, and for other purpose; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3223. A bill making appropriations for agriculture, rural development, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3222. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for the other purposes (Rept. No. 98-232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 3222. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 3223. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SIMON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 3224. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a taxpayer conscientiously opposed to participa-

tion in war may elect to have his income, estate, or gift tax payments spent for nonmilitary purposes; to create a trust fund (the World Peace Tax Fund) to receive these tax payments; to establish a World Peace Tax Fund Board of Trustees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 3225. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 to modify the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing bridges over the Norfolk Reservoir, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 3226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that tax-exempt interest shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of social security benefits to be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 3227. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Trade Act of 1974 to provide more equitable standards for determining the foreign market value of, and market disruption attributable to, goods manufactured in nonmarket economy countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 3228. A bill for the relief of the Williamsport-Lycoming Chamber of Commerce regarding the passenger vessel *Hiawatha*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 3229. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Montagnoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 657: Mr. HILER.

H.R. 881: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DYSON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. FOWLER.

H.R. 943: Mr. HOWARD and Mr. MARRIOTT.

H.R. 1083: Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1084: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 1199: Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 1266: Mr. GUARINI and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1307: Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 1329: Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 1494: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 1603: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1607: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. GRADISON.

H.R. 1609: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1615: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. NOWAK.

H.R. 1644: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 1653: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 1918: Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 2027: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2071: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 2124: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FUGUA.

H.R. 2153: Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.R. 2243: Mr. ECKART, Mr. LENT, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 2276: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LENT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. FISH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 2299: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 2440: Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 2468: Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2489: Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 2490: Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 2567: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

H.R. 2601: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. CORCORAN.

H.R. 2697: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. AKAKA.

H.R. 2747: Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 2820: Mr. SHANNON, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 2945: Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2946: Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2961: Mr. WON PAT, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.R. 2977: Mr. PARRIS and Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 3025: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WINN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 3062: Mr. BURTON.

H.R. 3071: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 3075: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.J. Res. 93: Mr. LUKE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.J. Res. 210: Mr. BLILEY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr., Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MICA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. CHAPPIE.

H.J. Res. 258: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SAWYER.

H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. BATES and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. WEISS and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 132: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 953: Mr. GEKAS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2915

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

—Page 15, after line 15, insert the following new section 118 and redesignate existing section 118 as section 119:

DANGER PAY ALLOWANCE FOR DUTY IN LEBANON OR EL SALVADOR

SEC. 118. (a) An employee serving in Lebanon or El Salvador during any month shall be paid a danger pay allowance under section 5928 of title 5, United States Code, for that month. The amount of such allowance shall be determined by the Secretary of State based on the severity of the conditions described in the first sentence of section 5928.

(b) The head of an agency shall pay a lump-sum payment to each employee of the agency who served in Lebanon or El Salvador during the period beginning on October 1, 1982, and ending on September 30, 1983. Such payment shall be the total amount the employee would have received as a danger pay allowance for such period under section 5928 of title 5, United States Code, by reason of service in Lebanon or El Salvador if subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on October 1, 1982.

(c) This section shall take effect on October 1, 1983. The authority to make payments pursuant to this section is subject to the availability of appropriated funds for that purpose.

(d) This section shall cease to apply on September 30, 1985, or—

(1) in the case of employees serving in Lebanon, upon the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from deployment in

and around Beirut, Lebanon, as part of the multinational peacekeeping effort in Lebanon; and

(2) in the case of employees serving in El Salvador, upon withdrawal from El Salvador of members of the United States Armed Forces who are providing defense services or military educational and training; whichever occurs first.

H.R. 3132

By Mr. EDGAR:

—On page 8, after line 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 104. Within funds available in the Construction General Account, including but not limited to funds deferred, the Corps of Engineers is directed to complete the navigation and related features of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway at a total federal cost not to exceed \$202,000,000. Section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: '(27) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway: From the Pickwick Pool on the Tennessee River at RM 215 to Demopolis, Alabama, on the Tombigbee River at RM 215.4.'".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHY I GIVE MY HEART TO THE
REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, one of the real foreign policy tragedies of our time is the American abandonment of the Republic of China. Few people know this tragedy better, or feel it more keenly, than Prof. Anthony Kubek of Tracy State University in Troy, Ala., who is also an adviser to the Western Goals Foundation of Alexandria, Va. He is the author of many books on China, the Far East, and communism. On Saturday, March 19, 1983, he delivered an address to the Shanghai-Tiffin Club of New York on the Republic of China. In this talk he set forth some of the great qualities of Chiang Kai-shek and the virtues of the Republic of China, which are not mentioned or have been forgotten by our historians. I commend his speech, slightly reduced, to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues.

WHY I GIVE MY HEART TO THE REPUBLIC OF
CHINA

(By Dr. Anthony Kubek)

After almost thirty years of teaching in the areas of social science in the United States, I try today to explain to you why I have given a part of my American heart to the Republic of China.

In the year 1970 I compiled two volumes of documents for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate. These volumes were published under the title *The Amerasia Papers: A Clue to the Catastrophe of China* and consisted of classified documents pilfered from several agencies of the U.S. government during World War Two and then handed over to an influential little magazine in New York City called *Amerasia*. The editors and supporters of this monthly publication, which circulated in the highest echelons of American officialdom at that time, were warmly sympathetic to the Chinese Communist movement of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. The stolen documents discovered by the F.B.I. in the *Amerasia* offices in 1945 were intended to be used to undermine the government of our ally the Republic of China under President Chiang Kai-shek.

Subsequently I was invited to Taipei by the late Paul Cardinal Yu-pin, rector of the Catholic university in Taiwan, and Mr. Yu Chi-chung of the *China Times*. My hosts told me that President Chiang Kai-shek had read the *Amerasia* volumes and wished to talk with me. I was with President Chiang for more than an hour, and I shall always remember what he said to me on that occasion and how he said it:

"Your State Department released a White Paper in 1949 blaming me for the loss of China to the Communists," the Generalissi-

mo said. "I was upset about it, and called in my advisors and asked what I should do. Some of them urged me to make public my side of the story; others advised me not to, since the situation was so sensitive in that period of the Korean crisis that my reply might irritate some officials in the Washington government. So I decided to wait, and for more than twenty years I suffered while waiting for some scholar to come out with the truth. And now you have given the truth."

Well, the documents in the *Amerasia* volumes tell the truth, and the facts are stranger than fiction. The United States was still at war with Japan, and the Republic of China was our ally. But a group of our bright young diplomatic officers, most of them the children of Christian missionary parents, were so enamored of the teachings of Mao Tse-tung that they came to regard the Communist Chairman as a kind of modern Confucius whose wisdom alone could lead China's hundreds of millions of villagers into peace, prosperity, and democratic happiness. They devoutly believed, as Edgar Snow had written in the early days of the Pacific war, that there was indeed a "Red Star over China." And they shaped their dozens of lengthy reports and dispatches to our State Department in Washington, D.C., in such a way as to undercut American support of President Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist party, the Kuomintang. Their single-minded and entire purpose in 1944-45 was to unhorse the Generalissimo and to make way for the coming of Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communist Party.

In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to hold up President Chiang as a straw man and to batter him with every imaginable invective. I dare say that no leader of the Free World in recent history, or perhaps in all modern history, has been more maligned, castigated, and vilified than the late President and Generalissimo of the Republic of China. And why? Because he broke sharply with the Chinese Communists back in 1927 and chased them up into the hills, where they had to remain for twenty years, and the leftists of this world could never forgive him for that. Chiang Kai-shek was the first world figure to sound the tocsin of warning against the insidious evils of Communism. He had seen the serpent up close and had smelled its deadly scent. And, to the end of his long life in 1975, he refused categorically to compromise with it.

Critics and debunkers always need to overlook certain facts that do not fit the negative portrait they paint. In President Chiang's case, it has been convenient to forget many things. Usually ignored is the important fact that during World War II the Chinese Nationalist armies tied down more than a million of Japan's best troops that otherwise would have been used against Americans in the South Pacific island campaigns. Also seldom mentioned is President Chiang's remarkable attitude toward Japan at the close of the war. Despite the destruction and havoc wrought upon his country by the Japanese, the Generalissimo did not thirst for revenge. Unlike

the Soviets in Europe in 1945, the Chinese Nationalist demanded no new territories or reparations to compensate the tremendous losses they had sustained as a result of the prolonged Japanese aggression in China. The magnanimity of President Chiang is illustrated by his reply, at the Cairo Conference in 1943, to President Roosevelt's question on what should be done about the Japanese Emperor after the war. Since Japan's imperial structure was historical and central to its form of government, the Generalissimo felt the Japanese people should be allowed to decide the question for themselves. When he said that, he gave Roosevelt and Churchill a lesson in generosity they did not expect.

It surprised me somewhat that Chiang Kai-shek, a lifelong soldier, chose to speak kindly even of his detractors and enemies. "No person is perfect," he said, "For God has given everyone shortcomings as well as strengths." It occurred to me, though I did not say it, that Chiang's great strength was also his shortcoming. He was simply too staunch an anti-Communist to be acceptable on a permanent basis to pragmatists who make diplomatic decisions by expediency. Principle and pragmatism cannot long live side by side.

But words are just words. The real testimony to Chiang Kai-shek's inspired leadership of the Chinese people is the miracle of Taiwan. It continues to amaze me how his Nationalist followers—that loyal and gallant fragment who left the mainland with him in 1949—were able, within just a few years, to transform an underdeveloped island into a modern, progressive state with a viable economy and a government stable enough to absorb change and achieve smooth transition. One of the true wonders of the modern world is the Republic of China on the island of Taiwan.

The late President was always quick to acknowledge the teachings of his mentor, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founder of the Republic of China in 1912, and the plain fact is that Chiang Kai-shek devoted his life to carrying forward the "Three Principles" which were Doctor Sun's legacy and blueprint for the future of China. The people of Taiwan today are fortunate to have that legacy and blueprint so admirably explained and illustrated by the late President's wise counsel. Unlike the cynical preachings and threadbare slogans of Chairman Mao, long since disavowed by the regimes which have been quarreling at Peking since his death, the words of Chiang Kai-shek can be re-read a thousand times and still retain their original freshness. Because Chiang was trained as a soldier and Mao spent his youth as a Librarian's assistant, some Westerners have assumed the wrong assumptions about modern China. They have taken Mao to be the towering intellectual, the latter-day Confucius, while regarding Chiang as just another provincial warlord. This, of course, is precisely the picture presented by the drafters of the *Amerasia* documents. I know the picture well, and I regard it as the most terrible distortion of the twentieth century.

Chiang Kai-shek regarded Christianity and Communism as being as incompatible as

fire and water. On the other hand, he considered Confucius as an East Asian prophet whose wisdom prepared the way for Christ in the Orient. He considered the spread of the Gospel of Jesus to have a great bearing on the rejuvenation and perpetuation of Chinese culture, and he constantly urged the assimilation of traditional Confucian values with the Christian teachings which inspired Western civilization. The Chinese Communists were well aware of President Chiang's wish to blend the two, for it was in the very year of his conversion to Christianity that he severed all connection between the Kuomintang and the Soviet-fashioned Chinese Communist Party. Once he saw the truth, he stood firmly by it and refused every temptation of expediency. In a word, he took seriously the Scripture which said: "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit."

My admiration for what Chiang Kai-shek accomplished in Taiwan, as a model for the rejuvenation of China, is frankly boundless. When the Nationalists went to Taiwan in 1949, there were many predictions of the collapse of the Republic of China within a year's time. But that move across the Strait, under the most adverse circumstances, turned out to be the beginning of one of modern history's most remarkable examples of comeback. When Mayor Lee Teng-hui of Taipei was asked how Taiwan was about to produce such a high standard of living for its people, he answered plainly: "The system encourages our people to work. There is no magic formula; it is the product of free people at work." The per-capita income in Taiwan will reach \$3,000 by the end of this year, as compared with less than \$400 on the mainland, and the gap between rich and poor in Taiwan is one of the narrowest in the world. According to a recent study by five Western scholars and published by the Oxford University Press, the Republic of China is one of very few "developing countries" to have achieved both a high rate of economic growth and a conspicuous improvement in distribution of income.

In his book, *Wealth of Nations in Crisis*, Ronald C. Narin says that Taiwan has developed "a highly successful agriculture, one of the finest in the world." Friedrich Hayek, the Nobel Prize economist and social philosopher, has said that the Republic of China can teach the world this important lesson: the free-market economy is the only way for "developing" nations to develop. There is little doubt about the buying and selling power of the Republic of China. Despite its diplomatic problems, the ROC currently trades with 149 countries and is one of the very few whose foreign-trade volume exceeds its Gross National Product. The overall two-way trade of the ROC exceeds forty billion dollars annually. The United States remains her largest customer and second largest supplier, with total trade in excess of twelve billion dollars despite some disruption of commercial relations "de-recognition" four years ago. The harbor city of Kaohsiung is fast becoming the "mother port" of Southeast Asia and a major trans-shipping point to all world markets.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn recently told a packed auditorium in Taipei: "Communist China hates you for your economic and social superiority. For them, it is not permissible that other Chinese should know that there can be a better life than Communism." The people of Taiwan enjoy a free political choice. Today there are three viable parties, plus the freedom to remain

independent of affiliation, and elections are scheduled regularly. The judiciary is independent of political control. People travel freely within the country, and hundreds of thousands go abroad each year. The national parliament functions smoothly, as do the provincial and municipal councils throughout the island. These are the advantages to which Solzhenitsyn referred.

Most people, of course, only learn about distant places through journalism. Will Rogers used to say that Americans only know what they read in the papers. Today it is not so much from the pages of newspapers as from the night air of broadcast journalism. The news reaches 40,000,000 people daily in the form of tight little capsules of carefully selected pictures and words between five and six o'clock each evening. What they learn depends entirely on who picks the pictures and writes the words. But once in a while a journalist writes a whole book about something of importance. Fox Butterfield of the New York Times has done so in a recent book about mainland China. He calls it *China—Alive in a Bitter Sea*, and I would strongly recommend it to anyone who wants to know what life is really like today on the mainland.

Time does not permit me to digest this interesting book for you. Suffice it to say that Fox Butterfield went to Peking in June, 1979, to open the first Times bureau there. Fluent in Chinese, he had studied with John K. Fairbank at Harvard and was thoroughly sympathetic to the Chinese Communist experiment. Once in Peking, however, he saw all his illusions shattered. The reality of Communist China was far different from what he had been taught. "I had to unlearn many of what I took to be the facts about China," he writes in his introduction, declaring flatly that the "breathless accounts of Western visitors" were almost always the result of an "official Communist tour" which cast "a kind of magic spell" over naive visitors. Read Fox Butterfield's book and you will get a good picture of the miseries of the mainland today. It will make you appreciate Taiwan all the more.

A writer in the *Asian Wall Street Journal* has recently said that "Taiwanization" is the only practical way for China to succeed in its much-touted modernization program. I agree four-square. We have heard a lot of talk during the past few years about the prospects of Chinese unification. Yes, that would be nice. But before there can be any kind of real unification the Peking regime must do four things:

Foresake the schemes and dreams of Marx and Lenin, including the grand goal of world revolution;

Get rid of the Communist Party dictatorship erected by Mao Tse-tung and his cohorts;

Disband the communes and return property to the people in some equitable way; and

Most of all, embrace the Three Principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen: Nationalism, Democracy, and People's Livelihood.

And NBC, ABC, and CBS can beam it on their satellites that this is the considered advice of an American who loves the Chinese people as much as his own!

The real Chinese revolution, ladies and gentlemen, is not taking place anywhere on the mainland. It is taking place on the island of Taiwan. Here are the real agrarian reformers; here are the true guardians of the rich Chinese culture. And here, in the example of the late President Chiang Kai-shek, is the only real hope for the unification of the Chinese people.

These are the plain, pure reasons why I give my heart to that brave, fine nation called the Republic of China. ●

NOW FREE VIETNAMESE FAMILY AT HOME IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it seems so long ago—and yet was only recently—that the world was aghast at the plight of the Vietnamese boat people and their heroic flight to freedom. As the focus of events shifted elsewhere, we put these people out of our minds, and with rare exceptions, we never wonder, aloud, about what happened to those courageous people.

I am pleased today to tell you what happened to one Vietnamese family of eight—a father, mother, four sons, one daughter, and one nephew. Under the sponsorship of six churches in my congressional district, they have found a new home, a new land, and a new hope in America. Moreover, they have endeared themselves to their neighbors and already seem to be achieving what we so fondly call the American dream.

This family came to the Fifth District of North Carolina under the auspices of the Lutheran Family Services' refugee resettlement program. Its local sponsors are Shiloh Lutheran Church, Unity Moravian Church, and Harmony Grove, Sharon, Concord, and Lewisville United Methodist Churches.

The Reverend James R. Faggart, minister of Lewisville United Methodist Church, explains the refugee family in this way:

Our family consisted of eight persons: father, mother, four sons, a daughter and a nephew. They were boat people. They came here after being in the Philippines for a long time. They are a delightful family. The father works in Kernersville as a welder, the nephew works also as a welder, the daughter works at a nursing home, one son worked at a restaurant for awhile but had opportunity to go north to college. The younger two boys are in school. They have often attended churches in the community, they are loved and respected and enjoyed. The family next-door has adopted them as "family." I have eaten in their home: they are clean, industrious, self-sufficient and happy.

The congregations found them a place to live: they have an automobile, they are self-sufficient, they have a garden, they keep their home spotless. They arrived with a small bag of clothing. The church provided housing, food, clothing. Within a few months they were self-sufficient. The churches helped find employment, saw that they had vaccinations, got the children into school, etc. I doubt that more than \$1,500 was expended.

They are an asset to this community: loving, appreciative, friendly. Somewhere down the road we will look into sponsoring

others. The United States has been great because we have cared for others: when we become self-centered and selfish, we will no longer be great.

The Reverend Mr. Faggart speaks well the sentiments of most Americans and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to share them with my colleagues.●

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN IRAN

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of May 26 included an editorial on Iran's persecution of members of the Baha'i faith. The title of the editorial, "Satanism in Iran," is an apt description of the outrages perpetrated by the Khomeini government.

On May 22, President Reagan issued a humanitarian appeal to Iran to end the executions and persecution of the Baha'is. I am sure that all Members of Congress join with the President in his request.

Following is the text of the President's statement and of the editorial from the New York Times:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., May 17, 1983.

America and the world are increasingly alarmed and dismayed at the persecution and severe repression of the Baha'is in Iran. Recently we have learned that the Government of Iran has sentenced 22 prominent members of the Baha'i Faith to death. This is in addition to the more than 130 who have been killed since the beginning of the revolution in Iran, including one man executed January 1, 1983, and three hanged in Shiraz on March 12, 1983.

These individuals are not guilty of any political offense or crime, they have not plotted the overthrow of the regime, and they are not responsible for the deaths of anyone. They only wish to live according to the dictates of their own consciences. I strongly urge other world leaders to join me in an appeal to the Ayatollah Khomeini and the rest of Iran's leadership not to implement the sentences that have been pronounced on these innocent people. Sparing their lives would be a step forward for Iran and the world community.

RONALD REAGAN.

SATANISM IN IRAN

The Devil, it is reliably reported, can quote Scripture. So can Iranian judges. Asked to explain why 22 adherents of the Baha'i faith had to die, a religious judge in Shiraz said it would fulfill a prayer of Noah, as recorded in the Koran: "And Noah said, Lord, leave not one single family of infidels on the earth; for if thou leave them they will beguile thy servants and beget only sinners and infidels."

Barbarism is rarely uglier than when it wears a clerical face. In the name of such precepts, Iran has killed at least 150 Bahais since 1979, jailed and robbed thousands more, and snatched children from their parents. It is a vile persecution that certainly warrants President Reagan's plea for the

lives of people whose only crime is their belief.

That is in fact conceded by the Shiraz judge. He complains that Iran's 300,000 Bahais "are against participation in politics." By abstaining, he said, they want to create, "however ridiculously," a state within a state. Yet he could not specify a single hostile act by a minority whose teachings instruct loyalty to their nation.

A Government that makes abstention a capital crime has grounds for killing anyone. The Baha'i creed abhors violence, promotes the equality of men and women and favors universal peace through world government. That is what the Dark Age bigots who rule Iran call Satanism.

Americans are helpless to halt the killings. But they should never cease to protest and they can join with other nations in providing asylum to those who manage to escape from this state of fanaticism.●

THE REVEREND JULE AYERS, D.D., RETIREMENT

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, June 12, the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church in Wilkes-Barre will honor their minister, the Reverend Jule Ayers, D.D., on the occasion of his retirement from the pulpit after 39 years of service.

This occasion, Mr. Speaker, is one both for celebration and for sadness in the entire Wyoming Valley.

With Jule Ayers, and his gracious and equally dedicated wife Alice, we celebrate 39 years of devoted service to God and man, of pastoral care, of military service, of volunteer work within the community, of ministering to the needs of thousands, both in body and soul. At the same time, we express our sadness that this outstanding career will now come to a close.

Jule Ayers was born in Detroit, Mich., on March 12, 1911. He graduated from Detroit Northwestern High School in 1929 and the University of Michigan 4 years later. In 1936, he graduated from the Union Theological Seminary in New York.

After pastoral assignments in New York and service as a chaplain with the 36th Fighter Group in the U.S. Army Air Force, Dr. Ayers came to Wilkes-Barre in 1944.

In addition to his work in pulpit and parish, on the streets and in community halls, he has found time to serve as a member of the board of directors of civic organizations almost without number. Important among them are the Family Service Association of Wyoming Valley, the Citizen's Advisory Committee to the Luzerne County Commissioners, the board of trustees of the YWCA, the Kiwanis Club, the Osterhout Free Library, public television station WVIA-TV, the labor-man-

agement citizens committee of the chamber of commerce, and the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the Selection of the First City Manager for the city of Wilkes-Barre. He has served as president of the Wyoming Valley Council of Churches and as moderator of the Lackawanna Presbytery. He has been chairman of the Division of Social Relations of the Pennsylvania State Council of Churches and president of the Pennsylvania State Pastors Conference. I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, and the time available could not exhaust the organizations Dr. Ayers has served and the good work he has done.

His service to mankind has been recognized by no less than three institutions of higher learning: By Lafayette College with the honorary degree of doctor of divinity, in 1953; by Wilkes College with the honorary degree of doctor of human letters, in 1974; and by my own alma mater, King's College, with the honorary degree of doctor of laws, in 1983.

But more important than the degrees and the honors, more important than service on boards and community recognition, have been the contributions which Jule Ayers has made in small, countless, every day ways. He has always been a compassionate heart, a willing ear, a shoulder to lean upon. Without respect to race, to creed, to religion or to ethnic origin, Dr. Jule Ayers has been a friend to mankind. When there have been community efforts, he has led them. When there have been community controversies, he has not been afraid to speak out for what he believed to be right.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that while he is retiring, Jule Ayers is not leaving us. He will remain in the community. The congregation of the First Presbyterian Church and his many friends beyond the limits of his pastorate are endowing the Jule and Alice Ayers Foundation, of which he will be the first director. In this way, he will be able to continue his life long avocation of helping those in need and participating in all facets of community life. He has been elected to a term seat on the board of the Osterhout Free Library, on which he has sat these many years ex-officio by virtue of his pastorate.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to join with the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church, with the entire Wyoming Valley community and with tens of thousands of men and women whose lives are better because they have known Jule and Alice Ayers, in paying tribute to a magnificent career and in wishing two wonderful people many, many more healthy and happy years of dedicated service to God and man.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on final passage of H.R. 3135, legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1984, I would have voted "no." ●

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM: NEEDED NOW MORE THAN EVER

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 of this year, the only Federal program in existence that is specifically designed to help American businesses and workers adjust to increased imports will be abolished unless something is done. In fact, President Reagan is recommending that the trade adjustment assistance (TAA) program be done away with at just the time that our country is coming to grips with stiffer foreign competition.

I ask my colleagues to take the time to read the following article I authored for the Christian Science Monitor to put in perspective the current debate over the TAA program. More importantly, I urge my colleagues to press for prompt action on the bill (H.R. 2083) sponsored by Congressman GIBBONS and myself to reauthorize the TAA program and to make improvements in it.

OFF THE JOB AND INTO THE BUNKER

(By Don J. Pease)

President Reagan recently decried America's apparent shift toward protectionism as a "bunker mentality" that is threatening free trade. Is Mr. Reagan truly bewildered by this shift of attitudes? Perhaps he needs a little historical perspective.

From the end of World War II into the early 1960s, the United States economy was largely self-reliant. It grew by leaps and bounds with no limits in sight. Most Americans saw their standards of living rise steadily. American industries and manufacturing workers—producing primarily for the domestic marketplace—were not threatened by imports per se. Free trade was a high-sounding principle which remained something of an abstraction.

Since the early 1960s, the American position in the world economy has changed dramatically. Our easy access overseas to critical raw materials at cheap prices has disappeared forever, while we draw down our domestic supplies. US exports have not kept pace with the flood of imports pouring into the American marketplace. Harvard's Prof. Robert Reich estimates that more than 70 percent of all the goods produced in the US were actively competing with foreign-made goods in 1980.

American business, industry, and labor were not prepared for the onslaught of for-

eign competition given entry to American markets in recent years by U.S. Government adherence to the principle of free trade. Accordingly, the U.S. trade deficit last year rose to a record \$47.8 billion. It is proving painful to come to terms with the new dynamics of international trade and with the plain truth that many American consumers now prefer foreign-made products.

There is a second reason why free trade has come under fire. Unlike his predecessors, President Reagan is ignoring an important means of sustaining broad-based popular support for free trade policies. While properly arguing that open markets and free trade serve the U.S. National interest (20 percent of all American goods now produced are exported), he is the first president in the postwar era to deny flatly that the federal government has any obligation or constructive role to play in helping thousands of Americans who are losing their jobs in American industries adversely affected by the ongoing surge of imports. This oversight in the President's perspective on international trade helps explain the surprising support in the Congress and among the American people for legislation like the "domestic content" bill.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the Trade Act of 1974 included provisions to extend assistance to firms and workers adversely affected by increased imports. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter all understood that pursuing trade liberalization in the national interest necessarily requires that some American industries and workers risk their markets and jobs to imports. That is why federal assistance has been available during the last 20 years to help trade-sensitive firms get technical assistance and loans to adjust to increased foreign competition. That is why America's labor leaders accepted free trade policies in exchange for what they thought at the time was a commitment by the federal government to provide adequate compensation, training opportunities, and job search and relocation aid to manufacturing workers thrown out of work by imports.

But President Reagan now proposes to abandon thousands of Americans who have lost their jobs in our basic industries (steel, auto, rubber, electronics, etc.) to foreign competition in recent years and to deny them means to reequip themselves to find new jobs. Seeking the benefits of free trade, the Reagan administration callously ignores its human costs in unemployment and bankruptcies across the country.

In his proposed budget for fiscal year 1984, President Reagan is requesting that the Congress abolish both the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program for firms in the Commerce Department and the TAA program for workers in the Labor Department. Yet it is modest programs of this sort that are so important to maintaining domestic support for free trade and that will allow U.S. industry and labor to meet the challenge of increased imports.

Don't get me wrong, the way the TAA programs were designed in 1974 and later administered had many flaws. For example, when auto industry layoffs soared in the late 1970s, the TAA program for workers operated almost exclusively as an income-maintenance program (more than \$1.6 billion in weekly benefits in fiscal 1980) with virtually no funds available for retraining workers certain not to be recalled to their old jobs (\$5.2 million in fiscal '80).

But that is not sufficient reason to dismiss blithely any federal responsibility, as Presi-

dent Reagan would have us do, for redressing the harmful domestic consequences of free trade policies set in Washington. Last year nearly \$10 billion was collected by the federal government in customs duties levied on imports. What would be wrong with setting aside a small portion of that \$10 billion collected from foreign manufacturers to finance the costs associated with retraining American workers who lose their jobs to foreign competition?

President Reagan has said that the U.S. and its trading partners are together in the "boat of open markets and free trade" in which holes are being shot by neo-protectionists. But to save the ship, he is ready to throw overboard many American workers and struggling businesses. ●

SOLOMON SCHECTER DAY SCHOOL'S SUPPORT FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 9, the children, teachers, and parents of the Solomon Schechter Day School of Marlboro, N.J., will be holding a Soviet Jewry rally in support of the Yehudit Nepomnishsky family, a Jewish family which has been denied the right to emigrate to Israel, and all other persons who suffer the same unfortunate plight. The rally is an active culmination of the children's year long study of Soviet oppression of its Jews and is yet another example of the school's efforts to help the Nepomnishsky refusenik family. I would like to commend these children and their teachers for their efforts on behalf of this and the many similarly situated families which are being persecuted daily in the Soviet Union.

This young school has engaged its children in a Soviet Jewry program of study and action. At the time of each Jewish holiday during the year, the children learn of Soviet Jews' risky attempts to celebrate that holiday. They meet brave Jewish dissidents as they view slides taken by the program's director, Mrs. Betsy Diamond-Spiegel, during her trip to the Soviet Union. Through their study of Soviet oppression, the children have come to appreciate more the freedoms which they enjoy in this country.

The Soviet Jewry program is designed with the intention of teaching the children what they can do to help those who are denied permission to leave the Soviet Union. Among other things, the children have written to U.S. Government leaders as well as to Premier Andropov in an effort to secure an exit visa for the Nepomnishsky family. They have also corresponded with the family and with other Soviet Jews and collected funds to provide for their assistance. Finally,

they are holding a rally this month to demonstrate their support.

The school's adopted family, Yehudit Nepomnishsky and her parents, are truly in need of this support. The family has been the subject of intense harassment by the KGB because they have applied for emigration and because Yehudit attempts to teach Hebrew in her hometown of Odessa. Since their application for emigration in 1979, the family's apartment has been searched and ransacked on several occasions. Yehudit's identification card has been confiscated and their phone has been ripped from the wall. Additionally, they have been the subject of threats of internal deportation as well as threats against their lives.

The Soviet Jewry program's director Mrs. Diamond-Spiegel visited the adopted family during her 1980 trip to the U.S.S.R. Upon her arrival at the Nepomnishsky apartment, KGB members, who were waiting in the courtyard, knocked Mrs. Diamond-Spiegel to the ground, slapped her in the face causing her glasses to fly off, and stole her shoulder bag from her. In two other instances, KGB members attempted to push her into an unmarked car. The brutal treatment of this American by the KGB serves as testimony to the treatment Soviet Jews, such as the Nepomnishskys, encounter regularly.

The Solomon Schechter School's Soviet Jewry program comes in response to the deteriorating situation which faces Soviet Jews today. Emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union has dropped to its lowest level since 1970. Only approximately 450 Jews have been allowed to leave the country thus far this year, a virtual shutdown of Jewish emigration compared to the more than 20,000 who were allowed to emigrate during the first 5 months of 1979. At the same time the many thousands of Jews who are forced to remain are subject to greatly increased harassment, discrimination, and religious persecution.

The school's year long support of the Nepomnishsky family and of all Soviet Jews is a great comfort for those struggling to leave the Soviet Union as it confirms for them that we in the free world have not forgotten their plight. The school's June 9 rally publicly demonstrates the outrage on the part of many Americans at the Soviet Government's shutdown of Jewish emigration and heightened persecution of the Jews within its borders.

I strongly applaud the Solomon Schechter School's Soviet Jewry program of study and action. I join with its children, teachers, and parents as well as the many Soviet Jewry advocates of this body, in continuing my strong and active support of Jews and all others to freely emigrate from the Soviet Union.●

COMMENDING TRAVIS FOR 40 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATION

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to rise today to pay tribute to Travis Air Force Base for more than 40 years of service to the Nation and security of the free world.

On June 10 of this year, Travis, which is located in my congressional district, will recognize its 40th anniversary in joint ceremonies celebrating the 25th anniversary of the 22d Air Force which has its headquarters at Travis.

Forty years ago, Travis was little more than an isolated airstrip. It had just two runways flanked by a couple of tarpaper shacks when it was officially activated as an airfield on May 17, 1943.

While Travis was originally established to defend San Francisco and the surrounding Pacific coastline from aerial attack, it was assigned to the Army's Air Transport Command even before it was officially activated because of its strategic location as a point of embarkation to the Pacific theater.

From July 4, 1943, when the first planes began arriving at Travis for the long flight to the Pacific war zone, until the fall of 1944, Travis was one of the most active bases in the area. The base was responsible for preparing B-24 Liberator bombers, B-25 Mitchells, and C-47 Skytrain transports for duty in the Pacific, and its personnel did so efficiently and enthusiastically.

Along with the rapid increase in activity came a rapid increase in the number of personnel stationed at Travis. The population at the base grew from a handful in 1943 to more than 2,000 enlisted men and 175 officers by the fall of 1944.

After World War II, Travis was made a permanent base and has grown now to the largest Air Force base in the West. Moreover, it is the home of the largest military airlift wing in the world which is responsible for, among other things, rapidly airlifting cargo and fighting forces to any and all points on the globe in the defense of our national interests.

The base is also home to one of the Air Force's largest medical centers—the David Grant Medical Center which serves as a teaching and training hospital and a referral center for Air Force personnel and their families living in eight Western States. David Grant also provides medical treatment to some 50,000-plus retirees and dependents in the immediate area and is

scheduled for a \$234 million facelift over the next few years.

In addition to its rich history and critical contribution to preserving our national security, Travis has made an enormous contribution, both economically and socially, to the surrounding cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vacaville, as well as to the rest of Solano County and the entire State of California.

For example, the economic impact on the surrounding communities is estimated at approximately half a billion dollars, generating jobs for thousands of local residents. Directly, the base employs roughly 11,000 people, including over 3,500 civilians. Indirectly, as a result of the more than \$163 million paid out in salaries and the millions of dollars in construction that occurs at the base yearly, jobs are created for tens of thousands of additional civilians in the area.

But perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Travis is a real part of the community. Most of the people of Travis become active in the community, and the community in return is very supportive of the base. They are partners in an effort to improve the well-being of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that the people of Solano County and the State of California feel very fortunate and proud to have Travis, a base of such import, in their midst. But with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I also think the people of Travis should, and do, feel very fortunate and proud, for nowhere in the Nation could a more supportive community be found than the one which surrounds Travis.●

A TRIBUTE TO KEN CAROLAN

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this evening at the Capitol Plaza Hotel in Trenton, N.J., a testimonial is being given in honor of Ken Carolan, a newspaper columnist for one of the city's daily newspapers, the Trentonian. Mr. Carolan is being honored for a lifelong commitment to and support of our local police and fire departments, veterans organizations, and business groups. Over the past decade, Ken Carolan has spoken out on countless occasions in support of those who defend our freedoms today and those who are responsible for preserving those freedoms in America's recent history. He has reported on and brought to light the many good things that are accomplished by our law enforcement officials and others who unselfishly dedicate their lives to assuring the safety, security, and well-being of our citizens. In short, Mr. Speaker,

Ken Carolan is a patriot and deserves to be recognized as such. He has been unafraid to speak out when he feels injustices have been done and equally unafraid to give the proverbial pat on the back for a job well done.

The testimonial this evening is being given by those very police officers, firefighters, veterans, business leaders, and others who realize that both sides of every story must be told, that the public has a right to be made aware of the good in our country, not just the bad. All too often our civic-minded citizens are ignored in favor of the flamboyant or the sensational. Those citizens' good deeds are given their due in Ken Carolan's columns.

We are all too aware that there are those who seek out gloom and doom under the mistaken notion that tragedy sells, who seem to take pride in maligning our Nation and its people. It is refreshing that at least one member of the news media is willing to concentrate on the positive. There is, of course, room for both sides in our Nation's vast media network, and I ask the Congress to join with me in acknowledging the work of Ken Carolan in seeking to strike a balance in news reporting. He is being honored tonight by the men and women who preserve our American way of life, and that is a high honor indeed.●

**ESTER SNEDDEN HONORED AT
RETIREMENT**

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1983, Mrs. Ester Snedden will retire as kindergarten teacher at Wren Avenue Elementary School in Corcoran, Calif. Mrs. Snedden has been a dedicated educator at Wren Avenue School for 32 years.

The early years of primary school mark a special time in a student's education. Especially for those children with special needs, success in kindergarten and first grade can set the tone for later years in elementary and secondary school. Mrs. Snedden has distinguished herself as a teacher who welcomes all children and assumes that each possesses a unique potential for excellence. Whether teaching basic cognitive skills, instilling in our youngest citizens a sense of civic pride or using her creative talent to impart musical and artistic appreciation, Mrs. Snedden has carefully nurtured her young students in an atmosphere of growth and friendship.

Through her diligent and creative leadership to improve curriculum in the field in kindergarten readiness, Mrs. Snedden has consistently sought to strengthen the educational system serving her students.

Mrs. Snedden has devoted her professional career to young students. And although she is retiring, her gift will continue for the many students who have a solid educational base and warm memories of early schooling thanks to Mrs. Snedden's dedication as a teacher and as a citizen.

I join Mrs. Snedden's many friends, colleagues and students, past and present, in paying tribute to her contributions to the educational enrichment of students at Wren Avenue Elementary School. I know that all Members of the House of Representatives join me in wishing Ester Snedden happiness and health in years to come.●

**IN MEMORY OF JUANITA
ROBERTS, L. B. J. EXECUTIVE**

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Juanita Duggan Roberts, a confidant and key aide to former President Lyndon B. Johnson, passed away. Those of us who worked alongside Juanita Roberts during the L. B. J. years know what an invaluable asset she was to President Johnson. Juanita Roberts began her service for L. B. J. when he was still a Congressman and continued that service when he was President. Both before and after L. B. J. left the Presidency, it was Juanita Roberts, more than any other person, who carefully and assiduously gathered and preserved the records of all the L. B. J. years. No public official in America—including F. D. R.—has had more of his personal records preserved than L. B. J. It was Juanita Roberts who was assigned to that task and carried it out to perfection. In her quiet and unassuming manner, she carried out this task with a dedication that we will remember as a great contribution to the Nation.

During the L. B. J. years, no matter how intense the debate or political battles were, through all of it, we could reach Juanita Roberts, get the proper information, and proceed with the work at hand. Juanita Roberts will be remembered as a dedicated public servant, and by me personally as a dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Washington Post published an obituary on Juanita Roberts which I would like to include in the RECORD in memory of this fine lady:

Juanita Duggan Roberts, 70, a principal secretary and confidant of Lyndon B. Johnson during his years as President, and who was one of the first officers of the Women's Army Corps to be promoted to colonel, died of cancer May 26 at Emory University Hospital in Atlanta.

Colonel Roberts had known Johnson since 1938 and became a member of his congressional staff in 1953. She remained close to Johnson after he left office. She was one of the key organizers of the LBJ Presidential Library at the University of Texas.

Friends remember her as a "quiet, competent secretary" who managed the mundane tasks of her office well. The President sometimes called her "Miss Efficiency," and called on her often to handle sensitive and touchy situations for him behind the scenes.

At the end of the Johnson administration, Colonel Roberts became a staff officer in the Pentagon headquarters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. She lived at the Watergate Hotel and spent much of her time attending to chores involved in running the LBJ Library. She was a member of the library's board of directors at the time of her death.

Colonel Roberts was born in Port Arthur, Tex., and graduated from Texas Woman's University in 1933. Five years later, she married H. Ray Roberts, who later was a Democratic Congressman from Texas. They were divorced in 1946.

During the 1930's, she worked as a home economist at Texas A&M University and was president and general manager of Holiday House, a tea room in Port Arthur.

She served on active Army duty from 1942 until 1946. Her decorations included the Legion of Merit. When Johnson became Vice President in 1961, she was placed back on active duty and promoted to colonel. She retired in the 1970s.●

**EVACUATION PLANS NEEDED
FOR COMMUNITIES WITH NU-
CLEAR REACTORS**

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be developing a potentially serious problem in one aspect of insuring the safety of people living near nuclear reactors, which may require congressional action.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the situation is as follows: The accident at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Powerplant underscored the necessity of developing more effective evacuation plans for communities adjacent to nuclear power facilities. Indeed, in order to operate a new or existing nuclear powerplant, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission now requires emergency preparedness plans assembled by each utility for the plant site, plus off-site plans prepared by the local and State governments. However, there is apparently no law mandating that local government officials actually prepare an evacuation plan in conjunction with the utility. Local officials, therefore, could prevent the continued operation of a nuclear powerplant by failing to exercise their responsibilities to prepare for an emergency.

The potential for this problem was foreseen by Congress, which added language in the 1980 and 1982 NRC authorization bills permitting the NRC to approve plans submitted by

utilities in the absence of approved State or local plans. The NRC has relegated the responsibility for approving evacuation plans to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA. It is my understanding, however, that FEMA has a declared policy of rejecting any utility plan that does not include local or State cooperation. Therefore, the problem remains unsolved.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the NRC consider the views of local officials and others residing near the site of an existing or proposed nuclear powerplant before granting an operating license. However, it is equally important and prudent that local government officials cooperate with utilities to insure the safe evacuation of citizens in the event of an emergency at the plant. I am particularly concerned about the danger of not preparing for an emergency at an existing plant, which could arise whether or not the plant is actually producing electricity.

Mr. Speaker, I am simply suggesting that if the NRC cannot resolve this dilemma, then it might be wise for Congress to explore the possibility of a legislative remedy.●

MILITARY HONORS STEVEN W. SMITH

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning, July 12, 1983, Steven W. Smith, an outstanding young man from northeastern Pennsylvania, will be honored by serving as the primary wreath presenter at the U.S. Army Wreath Ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va.

Steven, at the age of 17, has achieved the rank of cadet warrant officer with the Black Forrest Composite Squadron 1203-37256 of the Civil Air Patrol. In July 1981, while a trainee at Fort Indian Town Gap, Annville, Pa., he was named Pennsylvania Wing Encampment East Honor Cadet. More than 200 cadets were considered for this designation.

He is a qualified CAP cadet medic and has earned the PAWG Search and Rescue rank of ranger first class and has participated in more than 12 authorized emergency S.A.R. as a cadet team member, medic, and commander. He has completed all the requirements for the Civil Air Patrol/USAF Billy Mitchell Award and has been recommended for it by his squadron commander.

He has served in the capacity of support team member during two U.S. Army Wreath Ceremonies and during one U.S. Army Honor Ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns.

Recently he joined the U.S. Army Reserve under the split training program. He joined the 300th Army Field Hospital located in Hanover Industrial Park, Hanover Township, Pa.

It is an honor, Mr. Speaker, for me to commend this outstanding young man for his patriotism and his citizenship, and extend to him my best wishes for his continued success in future years.●

RID OUR HIGHWAYS OF DRUNKEN DRIVERS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, 1982, a young constituent of mine, Ted Morris, the only son of Frank and Elizabeth Morris, of Herndon, Ky., was struck and killed in a head-on auto collision. Ted was struck by an individual who was driving while under the influence of alcohol. The 98th Congress must work to rid our Nation's highways of the threat of people who are driving while intoxicated. I have received letters from Ted's grief-stricken parents, and I am certain that my colleagues will be interested in the parents' comments which follow:

HERNDON, KY.,
March 15, 1983.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: Thank you for your letter of sympathy upon the death of our son, Ted. Thank you also for your assurance that you are going to do all you can to rid our highways of drunken drivers. If Ted's untimely death can serve any purpose, perhaps it will be to make us more determined to pass legislation that will bring severe punishment to anyone who would drink and drive.

Congressman Hubbard, how many innocent people must die or be maimed before people committing the crime of drunken driving are justly punished for the horrible crimes they commit? We don't understand a society that will fine, punish, or confiscate the vehicle of someone who kills a deer out of season, or that will fight to protect a little-known fish called a snail-darter; yet, will shrug their shoulders when someone is murdered by a drunken driver.

Our precious Ted was a loving, compassionate young man who was a greater blessing than any two parents could ever hope for or begin to deserve. He was our beloved son, our only child.

Once again, thank you for your letter and your willingness to help rid our highways of drunk drivers.

Sincerely,

FRANK ADD ELIZABETH MORRIS.●

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL'S MEETING WITH THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1983, the Secretary-General of the United Nations spoke before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar spoke on a number of critical issues which should be of interest to all Members of the House.

Mr. De Cuellar mentioned the importance of working together in the U.N. Security Council, and discussed in depth the recent criticism of the United Nations. Mr. De Cuellar emphasized the importance of recognizing human rights, as well as solving the economic problems of the Third World. Finally, the Secretary-General spoke of the need to reduce nuclear arms and ease tension throughout the world.

I am pleased to share this important statement with my colleagues.

The statement follows:

TALKING POINTS FOR THE SECRETARY-GENERAL'S MEETING WITH THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my sincere thanks for the welcome which you have extended, and for this opportunity to meet with the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the other distinguished Members who are present today. May I first introduce several senior colleagues who are with me. Jean Ripert is the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, my senior colleague for economic matters. Brian Urquhart, whose special area of responsibility is peace-keeping and the Middle East, is Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs. Bill Buffum is a former American Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State who is now Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. I would also like to introduce Mrs. Phyllis Kaminsky, a gifted and energetic American, whom I have just appointed as Director of the United Nations Information Centre in Washington. I hope you will get to know her well as the senior United Nations Representative in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I am profoundly conscious of the role played by the United States Congress, and the Foreign Affairs Committee in particular, in shaping the present structure of international relations, including the establishment of the United Nations. I know of the high importance which President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull attributed to obtaining the support and understanding of this Committee's Members for the concept of a world organization of fully sovereign states which would unite their strength to maintain international peace and security and promote economic and social well-being.

It is frequently said that it was naive to expect the victorious powers in World War II to be able to work together in peace-time,

given the great disparity in interests and ideology between East and West. We all know that it has indeed proven difficult—for a good part of the time, impossible. But to me the concept of working together reflects an imperative. For unless there is a degree of co-operation among the five Permanent Members of the Security Council in dealing with conflict situations and unless these powers, especially the United States and the Soviet Union, support the Council and its decisions, the Council cannot fulfill its responsibility under the Charter to maintain peace.

I think the question must be asked: is the actual state of affairs in the interest of any of the major powers? Regional conflicts persist that take an enormous toll in human life and resources. They encourage arms acquisition, at the cost of economic development, and add to the fear and uncertainties that burden international relations. In some cases the disputes were not even brought to the Security Council until fighting was underway. The Council's resolutions, which, by the way, need the concurrence of all five Permanent Members, have too often been ignored. Looking at the war between Iran and Iraq, at the South Atlantic conflict, at the current tragedy in Lebanon, I do not believe that there is likely to be a long-term gain for any of the parties directly involved or for the major powers either. I would not suggest that the Security Council could necessarily have prevented or resolved all of these conflicts even if it enjoyed the authority of the combined support of the Permanent Members. But I can say that the Council's impact would have been far greater.

I am naturally conscious of the criticism in this country of the performance of the United Nations. Certainly there are legitimate grounds for criticism. If something isn't working well, one should say so—as I myself have done—with the purpose of improving it. On the other hand, criticism which is unjustified or without constructive purpose can diminish the authority of the Organization which is needed if it is to be.

One of the most frequent criticisms is that the United Nations is an extravagant organization—that our budget is out of control. As the largest contributor to the United Nations—twenty-five percent—the United States certainly has full justification in following this subject closely—in particular, the United States Congress, which has the ultimate authority on American expenditures. I feel it may be worthwhile for me to give you a few facts.

Over the past eight years, the annual growth in United Nations expenditures has been only two percent in real terms. This increase stems from the belief of the majority of the 157 Member States that the Organization should do more in the political, economic and social fields. I consider it my duty and responsibility in the interest of all Member States to ensure the greatest possible efficiency in the utilization of available resources. The budget which I am submitting for the 1984/85 biennium provides for real growth of only 0.7 percent. It may be of interest to you to know in this connexion that, on a per capita basis, the United States ranks twelfth in its contributions to the United Nations.

May I just add, by the way, that it is extremely important that the assessed contributions of Member States be received on time. Delayed payment results in heavier expenses and inefficiency—not in greater economy.

Another frequent criticism of the United Nations is that it has become increasingly

politicized. The attention and the time devoted now in some of the operational agencies to political issues, especially with regard to the Middle East and southern Africa, gives rise to understandable concern. The ultimate answer to this problem is to achieve, with all of the efforts which that will require, fair and lasting solutions to these problems.

In this connexion, it must be borne in mind that certain fora in the United Nations system, such as the General Assembly were specifically designed to serve as political arenas for the airing of problems. As distinct from operational and other organs such as the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat, it would go against the grain of the General Assembly and run counter to the conception of the founders of the United Nations to deprive them of their political character. Indeed, it would be as if an attempt were made to turn the United States Senate into a merely technical body. And let us not forget that the General Assembly's decisions, aside from the those on budgetary questions, are recommendatory in character.

The fact should not be obscured, in any event, that the important operational work of the United Nations agencies is going on successfully. Millions of refugees in many parts of the world are being assisted by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in environments of high political sensitivity without adverse impact of politicization. Progress is being made in the promotion of health, education and other fields on the basis of co-operation at the operational level among the 157 Member States of the United Nations. The United Nations Development Programme operates very effectively on the basis of consensus under the leadership of your former Congressional colleague, Brad Morse, in bringing assistance to developing countries. Both the United States and the USSR are on its Governing Council.

These achievements show that the concept of an international organization in which the sovereign states of the world are joined in common purpose can work and is working in important fields. The United Nations, let me add, is ready to move quickly to provide the necessary military and civilian personnel and services in Namibia the moment the necessary conditions have been achieved for implementation of Security Council resolution 435. We had the same capability to move quickly in providing observers and administrators that might have been part of a peaceful resolution of the Falklands/Malvinas conflict.

The United Nations peace-keeping forces have been effective in preventing renewed conflict and affording an opportunity to find lasting resolutions of disputes. They fulfilled their mandate in southern Lebanon with remarkable courage although they were neither authorized nor equipped to meet a massive movement of forces into their area of operation. At present, the United Nations, and only the United Nations, is engaged in seeking a political solution of the Afghanistan problem. I am deeply concerned about the deteriorating situation in Central America and I have offered my good offices to the parties.

Maintenance of peace, of course, entails many things besides the resolution of immediate political conflicts and crises. Lasting peace will surely depend, too, on international economic co-operation, progress in social justice and human rights, and a reduction in arms.

Progress toward securing greater respect for human rights is slow and difficult, but there is movement, and I attach high priority to the effort. The United Nations deals with such problems both publicly and privately. The Human Rights Commission is an inter-governmental body which has moved beyond its earlier concentration on standard setting to scrutiny of human rights violations in every part of the globe.

Further, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, I myself try, by the exercise of quiet diplomacy, to discourage persecution of vulnerable groups, summary executions, arbitrary imprisonment and other violations of individual human rights.

I am convinced of the great political importance that must be attached to economic issues. There are signs of economic recovery in some industrial countries, in particular in the United States, which, in the longer term, offer much hope for the world economy. However, the economic situation in developing countries remains poor and, in some cases, desperate. There are indications that hunger, malnutrition and disease are actually on the rise as governments are constrained to reduce support to the poor elements in these societies.

Recovery in industrial countries will take time to produce renewed growth in the developing world. Meanwhile, a deepening recession in the Third World can abort recovery in the industrial world. This means that immediate action will be needed beyond what is already contemplated to strengthen the liquidity of the developing countries and lighten their debt burden. The markets for their products must be kept open and their commodity earnings stabilized.

In these areas the United States can play a key role in providing leadership among the industrial countries. I am greatly heartened by decisions in the Congress in the past few weeks which will greatly improve the financial situation in United Nations instruments of development and co-operation such as IDA and UNDP. I trust that leaders of the industrialized countries meeting in Williamsburg will take into account the constructive approach shown by the developing countries both in the New Delhi Summit and in the Group of 77 meeting in Buenos Aires. The forthcoming session of UNCTAD in June should provide an opportunity for progress.

The relationship between arms and security is perhaps the most fateful problem of the present era. It is one with which I know the House of Representatives is deeply preoccupied. I personally am convinced that greater security is not likely to be obtained through a further expansion of weapons of mass destruction or their deployment in the areas of the deep sea-bed and outer-space, which until now have remained protected. I have had the opportunity to speak with President Reagan and more recently with General Secretary Andropov, and I am convinced that there is an opportunity now to find a means of stabilizing the military relationship between East and West and beginning the essential process of reducing nuclear weapons.

In this connection, let me end by stressing that a strong and effective United Nations can facilitate a reduction in arms. First, it can contribute to the resolution of conflicts and crises that add tension to the relationship between the major powers; secondly, with regard to the smaller regional countries, a strong United Nations can offer a promise of security which can lessen the tendency on the part of these governments

to feel that their security can only be assured through military strength; and thirdly, it can contribute to economic development and social progress, thereby diminishing the causes of instability that frequently lead to recourse to arms.

This is a further reason why the strong support which the Congress has given to the United Nations over the years is as far-sighted for the United States as it is essential for the United Nations.●

TO CUT OR NOT TO CUT

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1981, Congress passed the Economic Recovery Tax Act (ERTA) which provided tax cuts for individuals and businesses. Included were a phased cut in all income tax rates of about 25 percent, a cut in the maximum tax rate from 70 to 50 percent—effective January 1, 1982—and indexing of the Tax Code—annual adjustment for inflation—starting in 1985.

Repealing the final leg of the 3-year tax cut, repealing the final 10 percent, would actually mean retroactively repealing half of the cut in tax rates which already went into effect on January 1, 1983, as well as repealing the final 5-percent rate reduction scheduled to begin January 1, 1984.

Repeal just is not fair. Since high-income taxpayers have already had the top rate cut from 70 to 50 percent, tampering with the third year would fall mostly on lower and middle income taxpayers. Fully 70.6 percent of the July, 1983 tax cut goes to those with incomes below \$50,000 per year. Only 11 percent goes to those with incomes over \$100,000.

Repeal of the third year hurts the middle class the most; 38 percent of the total tax cut for a taxpayer in the \$20,000 to \$30,000 range is contained in the third year. This taxpayer will see his tax liability rise by almost 12 percent in 1984. In fact, if the third year is repealed the typical American family will receive no net tax reduction at all. This is because the first 2 years of tax cuts are more than offset by the combination of payroll tax increases and the bracket creep which occurs before indexing begins in 1985. This does not even include the social security package, which accelerates future payroll tax increases. It takes the full 3-year tax cut plus indexing to keep the read tax burden from rising.

Robert F. Dee, chairman of the board, SmithKline Beckman Corp., has written an "Issues for Action" article about the need to retain the third year tax cut. In his article he cites the principal argument in favor of the tax cut is that it will unquestionably create more jobs.

I commend this article to my colleagues in the House as I believe it is a fair and accurate description of the reasons why the Congress should not cut the third year tax relief measure.

The article follows:

TO CUT OR NOT TO CUT

(By Robert F. Dee)

(If Congress disappoints the taxpayers of America by repealing the expected income tax rate reduction on July 1, their action will hurt those most in need of income tax relief.)

Has the experiment failed?

That's how the House Budget Committee in its first resolution described the President's economic program, "the experiment that failed." Meanwhile, the Committee is calling for a \$30 billion tax increase in 1984.

At the same time, economic indicators have surged to a record monthly high, new housing starts are at nearly double the rate of June 1982, gross national product is growing at 4% a year, the stock market has risen 50% since July 1982, new unemployment claims are down and the unemployment rate is falling.

AVERAGE AMERICANS

At this critical juncture in what appears to be a long-awaited recovery, some members of Congress are urging repeal of the July 10% income tax rate cut—the third—called for in the President's economic plan.

They claim that the first two tax rate cuts had nothing to do with the recovery, that supply-side economics hasn't worked—and that being the case, it makes no sense to give taxpayers more tax relief now.

They may also believe they can spend the billions of dollars involved more wisely than average Americans can.

MOST IN NEED

"Average" is exactly the word to describe the people this tax cut will benefit most—middle and lower income Americans.

Households making between \$10,000 and \$50,000 a year pay about two-thirds of all income taxes. These Americans will get about 72% of the benefits from the 1983 tax rate cut. Those earning above \$100,000 a year will get only 9% of the tax relief although they pay over 15% of all income taxes.

So if Congress disappoints the taxpayers of America by repealing the expected income tax rate reduction on July 1, their action will hurt those most in need of income tax relief.

BITTER EXPERIENCE

The issue is complicated by the fact that the United States at present has the largest public debt in its history. Instead of cutting taxes, some legislators say that these tax revenues could be used to reduce the deficit.

That argument makes sense—except that bitter experience has convinced most Americans that the more money Congress has, the more it spends. Nobody really believes that tax revenues will be used to reduce the deficit.

LOCOMOTIVE OF RECOVERY

The principal argument in favor of the tax cut is that it will unquestionably create more jobs.

Repeal of the tax rate cut would keep a sizable tax burden clamped on the small business sector, which is the locomotive of economic recovery. About three-quarters of all businesses in the country aren't corporations. They report their business income through individual tax returns.

Yet 80% of new jobs are generated by firms with 100 or fewer employees. Small businesses produce 48% of the country's output, 43% of the gross national product and more than 50% of all industrial inventions and innovations.

Small business is already taxed at a higher rate than most large corporations. A repeal of the expected July 1 tax rate cut could stall the small business locomotive in its tracks—and thereby nullify an essential factor in the recovery.

ACTION NOW

The question of "to cut or not cut" will be argued in Congress in the next few weeks.

This message offers one view of the matter. You may well have another. But the important thing is for all of us to make our views known in Washington by informing our legislators of our opinions now.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM D. MOSLEY

HON. LYLE WILLIAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, the friends and associates of Dr. William D. Mosley will celebrate with him in Warren, Ohio, the 50th anniversary of his service to God and man.

On June 10, 1933, Dr. Mosley entered the Christian ministry. From then until now, this educator, minister, college president, Army veteran, and community servant has compiled an enviable record of accomplishment.

Dr. Mosley has served as president of Cincinnati Baptist Bible College, president of the Congress of Christian Education (Ohio Baptist Convention), faculty member of the University of Cincinnati in the department of sociology and Afro-American studies, director of Christian education for the Ohio Baptist Convention, faculty member of the Congress of Christian Education (National Baptist Convention), taught in the Cincinnati public school system, and served on the faculty of Kent State University, Trumbull Campus, Warren, Ohio.

Dr. Mosley is a member of Alpha Kappa Delta, the National Honorary Society of Sociologists; a member of Omega Psi Psi Fraternity; a member of the American Association of University Professors.

He has attained high stature in Freemasonry, and his community service record is best appreciated by scanning the list of organizations of which he is a member: Warren Senior Citizen Advisory Commission; Kent State University Advisory Board, Trumbull Campus; Warren Fair Housing Commission; Community Resource Seminary, Inc., Warren; Warren Library Association; Northeastern Council on Alcoholism Board of Advisors; Trumbull County YMCA Board of Trustees;

executive board, Warren Reserve Council, Boy Scouts of America; director, Police/Clergy Crisis Counseling Team; International Conference of Police Chaplains; and president, Trumbull County Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance.

In 1976, Dr. Mosley was cited for outstanding service to the ideals of brotherhood by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

A veteran of World War II he served with the 372d Infantry Regiment and the 92d Infantry Division as sergeant major. Following military service in the European Theater of Operations, he was honorably discharged as a master sergeant.

Dr. Mosley, the father of six children, is married to Ruth Geneva Mosley who will share his recognition.

It is a pleasure to share in the commendation of Dr. Mosley, and to join those who celebrate his life. ●

RECOGNITION OF DR. WILMER S. CODY, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize, before my respected colleagues, the work of Dr. Wilmer S. Cody, superintendent of the Birmingham public school system. Dr. Cody will be leaving Birmingham as of July 1, 1983, to assume the position of superintendent of the Montgomery County, Md., school system. Dr. Cody has guided the Birmingham City school system for the past 10 years, and leaves behind an excellent record of achievement. I would like to submit as a part of this statement, excerpts from a recent edition of the Washington Post, which tell of the successes of this outstanding leader.

Excerpts from Washington Post article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1983]

A QUIET FIGHTER—MONTGOMERY SCHOOL POST CANDIDATE STRESSES PLANNING

(By Elsa Walsh)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—In 1963, writing from a jail cell here, Martin Luther King, Jr., called this industrial city "the most thoroughly segregated in the United States." Now, 20 years later, Birmingham, unlike some northern cities, is on the brink of being released from a school desegregation plan imposed by a federal judge because it will have met its integration goals.

By most accounts, the person primarily responsible for the schools' progress during the last 10 years is Wilmer S. Cody, Birmingham's 46-year-old superintendent of schools, who is the leading contender to be the next school chief in Montgomery County, Md.

In what a leading national educator calls one of the toughest superintendent's jobs in

the nation, Cody was credited with leading the Birmingham school system through a racially troubled period without the violence that marked other southern schools.

Under Cody's leadership, the Birmingham schools, with a budget one-fifth the size of Montgomery's to provide for half the number of students, raised test scores significantly; got accreditation for its elementary schools; started kindergartens; won the first successful property tax increase for schools in half a century; closed schools for the handicapped and mainstreamed those students into regular schools; required elementary pupils to pass promotion tests; increased high school requirements; and eliminated all totally white schools without the involuntary busing of any student outside his or her neighborhood.

Cody also integrated his staff: Three of his five assistant superintendents are blacks, and teachers of both races are divided evenly among all schools.

Both his supporters and detractors attribute Cody's successes to a low-key negotiating style based on long-term planning. Cody is a man serious and broad about his convictions, but undramatic in their implementation. In three days of interviewing, not one person closely associated with Cody's work here could recall a particular speech that they would describe as inspirational or an event in which he called upon his colleagues or the public to rely on some sort of moral judgment.

Instead, Cody, a Harvard-educated administrator who began his career as an elementary school teacher in his native Mobile, Ala., was repeatedly described as a methodical yet visionary man who has a plan and list of goals for nearly everything he does. Within months after arriving here, Cody released "An Agenda for Birmingham Schools," a blueprint for what he thought the system needed and what steps should be taken to achieve them. Nearly every one of those goals is included in the list of accomplishments above.

Although he is often described as unforceful and willing to compromise, Cody has been intransigent on what he considers matters of principle. Last year, Cody's nomination by U.S. Department of Education Secretary Terrel Bell to head up the National Institute of Education was reportedly rejected by the Reagan administration after he criticized federal cuts in education programs.

"You need to picture what Bill Cody walked into," said Louis Dale, president of the five-member appointed school board and chairman of the math department at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. "The city government at one time had turned police dogs on demonstrators. Martin Luther King was jailed here. The Klan was here. Whites were leaving the city and even though the court order to desegregate the schools had come down 10 years earlier, for all intents and purposes, the schools still were segregated."

"We had all this turmoil in the streets but somehow Cody managed to keep it from spreading into the schools," Dale said. "He did it by being strong and low-key. He was committed, but he was patient. He was quiet, but he was a fighter. He knew how far he could take the school system, but he also had the perception to know what he could and could not do. And, somehow through it all he made this school system, one that had nothing, a progressive one. It still amazes me. He is probably the most respected white man in the black community."

Sitting in his sparsely decorated wood-paneled office here last week, Cody, the son of a tool-and-die maker, educated in Mobile's segregated schools, said his desegregation plans were born simply out of a belief in fairness.

Although proud of his desegregation accomplishments, Cody, who supervised a voluntary desegregation program as superintendent of Chapel Hill (N.C.) schools before coming here, said he would prefer to be remembered for influencing the way students think.

"I would like to think that my legacy here will be that all students are being taught and learning more today than they were when I first came here," he said, pointing to test scores that have shown a continuous increase. As an example, Cody said that in 1975, eighth graders were scoring nine months below the national average in math; last year, they were three months above the average.

I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to pay tribute to Dr. Cody, and I congratulate the Montgomery County Board of Education for their outstanding selection. In closing, let me personally thank Dr. Cody for all that he has done for the people of Birmingham. ●

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN GREENVILLE, S.C.

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, much debate has been devoted recently to the decline in the quality of our Nation's public schools. Without question, maintaining a high standard of education deserves our fullest attention. In that light, it is a pleasure to recognize some outstanding accomplishments realized by the public schools of Greenville, S.C., which is located in my district. The following individuals and schools represent a commitment to educational excellence by the Greenville County School District community:

MODEL SCHOOLS: PALMETTO'S FINEST

Sara Collins, Augusta Circle, Crestview, Pelham Road, League Middle, and Greenville Middle have been chosen "Palmetto's Finest," an award that puts them at the top of the class . . . in South Carolina! Skyland Elementary School was the Congressional District 4 Award winner.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION FOR LEAGUE MIDDLE

League Middle School is representing South Carolina in a search for the nation's top schools. State Superintendent of Education, Dr. Charlie Williams, nominated League Middle to the United States Secretary of Education. An on-site visit has been made.

SOUTH CAROLINA'S TEACHERS OF THE YEAR

Jane Satterfield, Sara Payne, and James Mattos have been recognized as "South Carolina Teacher of the Year" for their outstanding contributions to the youth of this state. Each continues to improve the quality

of education in The School District of Greenville County.

PTA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Sara Utsey, a kindergarten teacher at Crestview Elementary was recently named South Carolina PTA Teacher of the Year. Mrs. Utsey, says she has no plans to slow down after nineteen years of teaching. "As long as I can continue to give to the children, I'll teach," she said. Now you know why she's teacher of the year!

SCIENCE FAIR WINNERS

The School District of Greenville County won 57 percent of all awards presented at the Western South Carolina Region II Science Fair held this spring at Greenville TEC. Competition was stiff, and students from public and private schools from all over the upcountry presented science projects.

STUDENT OF THE YEAR

Pat Tierney, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Tierney and a Mauldin High School student, recently won Greenville's much coveted "Student of the Year Award." Pat had the highest College Board score (1510) of any Greenville student. He plans to attend the Naval Academy next year.

NATIONAL AWARD WINNER

Mr. Robert D. Powell, Northwest Middle School, won a Certificate of Excellence Award from the National Band Association.

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES AT OR ABOVE NATIONAL AVERAGES

Standardized test scores are the highest in the district's history, many are at or above national norms.

GOVERNOR'S AWARD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Mauldin High School and Augusta Circle Elementary won the Governor's Award for Citizens Participation Award for their excellent citizen involvement program. Ms. Marilyn Koon and Mrs. Sandra Welch are the motivating forces behind this award.

NATIONAL MERIT SEMI-FINALIST

Twenty-seven Greenville students scored high enough on the NMSQT to be designated national merit semi-finalist for 1982-83. That's the highest number of national merit semi-finalists the district has ever had.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT HELPS WITH COLLEGE

Three hundred ninety-five Greenville students will go to college next year with college credits already under their belts. The district's Advanced Placement (AP) program provided them with the opportunity.

NATIONAL ARCHITECTURE AWARD

Greenville Elementary School won national architectural recognition at the 1981 annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators.

CAROLINA HIGH SCHOOL'S WINNING ACADEMIC TEAM

Carolina High School, after winning the district's Scholastic Scoreboard competition, represented Greenville in national competition at Jacksonville, Florida. The team placed third.

ADOPT-A-SCHOOL: A PARTNERSHIP THAT'S PAYING OFF

Over forty (40) Greenville businesses and thirty (30) schools have joined together to improve the quality of education in Greenville. Last year one vocational center received help valued at more than \$100,000 from one local industry.

SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS

In 1982, 19,395 volunteers, provided inestimable help to students and teachers at a total value of over a half million dollars.

TOUGHER STANDARDS

Tougher standards in grading, attendance, and promotion have been implemented this year to provide students an orderly environment in which to learn.

FINE ARTS ARE TOPS

The district's Fine Arts Program continues to be one of the best in South Carolina. Recently sixteen (16) out of twenty-one (21) orchestra ensembles won a superior rating in state competition.

OUTSTANDING ETV PROGRAM

The district's Educational Television and Instructional Television (ETV/ITV) Program was recently recognized as the 1983 Outstanding School Media Program of the Year by the Association for Educational Communication and Technology. Hugh Atkins heads the program.

OUTSTANDING SCIENCE TEACHER

Mr. Michael Farmer, Riverside High School, was chosen the 1983 Outstanding High School Teacher of Science/Mathematics by the South Carolina Academy of Science and Cryovac.

A TRIBUTE TO AGATHA SOLOMON

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give recognition to a special resident of my district. On the evening of June 9, Agatha Solomon, who is 100 years old, will be the guest of honor at the State of Israel bonds dinner sponsored by the Temple-Congregation Shomer Emunim in Sylvania, Ohio. Agatha will be the recipient of the prestigious State of Israel's "Jerusalem, City of Peace" award.

Agatha is being recognized not only because of the miracle of her longevity, but also because of what she has done during her many years. Agatha Solomon has been a constant source of inspiration and security for all those with whom she has come in contact. She has been and remains to be a community leader. There are few people that make a lasting impact on the communities in which they live. The community I love has been blessed with more than its fair share of such people and one of them is Agatha Solomon.

TOM TIGHE—A GREAT NEWSMAN

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, many young reporters cover the news for a

few years and then move into other more lucrative careers. But some never leave. These are journalists with a deep sense of purpose and mission who mold the course of their profession, serve the public interest and help to insure a free press. They are journalists until their dying day.

Such a man was Thomas B. Tighe, editor emeritus of the Asbury Park, N.J., Press who died May 19 after a 60-year career in journalism. He had held every position at the Press since he started there in 1916 as a paperboy. As errand boy, clerk, reporter, city editor, production manager, general manager, and executive editor, Tom Tighe won the praise and affection of all with whom he worked.

He took a sabbatical for 9 months in 1941 and served here on Capitol Hill as administrative assistant to Representative William H. Sutphin, Democrat, of New Jersey. He worked for 3 months as Monmouth County aide to Mr. Sutphin's successor, Republican James C. Auchincloss, who preceded me as Representative of the Third Congressional District.

Tom Tighe shared his knowledge with young journalists as a teacher of newspaper management at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism. In 1965, shortly before winding up his part-time teaching responsibilities, he was elected president of the New Jersey Press Association. His editorial writing won first place in that association's 1979 editorial competition.

During his many years at the Press, the paper grew from fewer than 100 employees to 500. It provided expanded coverage to the growing counties of Monmouth and Ocean. It is now considered one of the best edited and most financially successful papers in the State of New Jersey.

Much of the credit for this progress rests with Tom Tighe, who I considered a personal friend for many years. His wife of 53 years, Helen R. White, his daughter and other family members, can be very proud of this fine man and his contributions to journalism and to life at the Jersey shore.

FRANK "OZZIE" ESTOCHIN'S RETIREMENT

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest feelings of friendship that I rise to commend to your attention one of the greatest characters you will ever meet—Frank "Ozzie" Estochin. Unable to attend a celebration held in his honor, I take this opportunity to ask the Congress to join me along with his many friends

and admirers in expressing our deep appreciation and gratitude to this outstanding human being upon the occasion of his retirement.

It was in the year of our Lord 1917, on August 22, that there was born in Akron, Ohio, one Frank John Joseph Estochin—the only son of Frank and Mary Estochin. Frank and Mary were immigrants from Prague, Czechoslovakia. According to Frankie's sisters, Anne Neidert and Mary Bobinski; school chums had some difficulty pronouncing their ethnic surname—Estochin—thus their brother received the nickname "Ozzie" by which he has been hailed by friends and fans alike to this day.

Upon graduation from Garfield High School in Akron in 1935, Ozzie enrolled at Kent State. He was an outstanding athlete playing as the star first string center on the Kent State football team. In 1942 he met Jane and they were married the following year, making 1983 the year of their 40th anniversary. Frank and Jane have two children, James 31, and Lisa 28.

Frank Estochin really came into his own when he joined the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., in 1947. He was early recognized for his talents as a salesman, a manager, and a teacher. For years he has served as the mortar that helped build one of the finest life insurance agencies in the country. The Los Angeles agency of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., through the years of Fred Schnell, G. Sydney Barton, and finally Daniel Coelho has grown to be recognized as among the great. No small part of that pattern of success will be traced to the unique personality and array of capabilities that make up Frank Estochin.

The most sophisticated form of selfishness is—giving. If that is the case, then Ozzie would be ranked among the most selfish, for he virtually never stopped giving. The contribution he has made to the success of some of the finest salesmen our business has ever known—men like Joe O'Connor, George Rowland, Tony Marrone, King Archer, and so many others—will remain as a living tribute to Frank Estochin's success in life.

And, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow a personal note—this Member of the House owes to Frank Estochin a full measure of appreciation for whatever success he might experience. Frank has been my teacher and my friend—ever present, ever willing to help, ever giving.

While you enjoy this new stage in life just remember there are those of us who will never forget—Frank John Joseph Estochin—also known as Ozzie—you are a great guy.●

JIM HERBERT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS RETIRES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated public servants I know is retiring from the Army Corps of Engineers this week. Mr. James T. Herbert, Jr., is capping his career as the technical publications writer-editor in the executive office of the engineer district in Fort Worth, Tex.

That bureaucratic-sounding title does not really tell the full story on Jim Herbert. Those of us in the Texas congressional delegation have for several years come to respect this man for his help and knowledge of the corps and for getting things done in Washington.

Jim has been with the Corps of Engineers since 1947, having served in the U.S. Army from 1943 to 1946. Since 1959, he has been assigned to the Fort Worth office. During his tenure, he has seen many district commanders, as well as Members of Congress come and go. I would hasten to speculate that Jim knows more about this body and the corps than some of us do.

We know him as that pleasant, kind man with a honey-smooth voice and southern accent, reflecting his hometown of Vicksburg, Miss. But Jim is more than just a nice guy. He has been extraordinarily helpful in explaining projects to the Congress and the public. He has worked closely with local leaders and groups to coordinate action in Washington and in localities where projects are planned or underway.

Too often, Federal employees are not shown the proper respect. Jim Herbert has served as a rebuttal of those occasional criticisms. He represents the Army Corps of Engineers in a forthright and helpful way, reflecting the agency's priorities of public service and progress. Jim shows the fine combination of civilian and uniformed expertise we have come to know at the corps. With his years of service and distinction if he was a military person, his uniform would be loaded with stars and bars.

Jim has many loyal friends, and speaking on behalf of the Texas congressional delegation, as well as our two Senators, I just want to say how much we thank Jim for his splendid performance for our State and country. We wish Jim Herbert the best of luck in his retirement.●

POMP, CIRCUMSTANCE, AND SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the elemental characteristics of the ideology variously known as modern liberalism or progressivism is the near-religious employment of the double standard. One of the most traditional targets of this inherent dishonesty is the Republic of South Africa.

I include in the RECORD a recent article on this subject written by Hadley Arkes for the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Arkes is William Nelson Cromwell, professor of jurisprudence at Amherst, and has been visiting as the Leavey professor at Georgetown University.

The season of commencements now upon us again has become for many faculty a time of resentments artfully restrained and forbearance practiced with a show of urbanity. Last year at this time, I returned to Amherst College, my home for 16 years. I went with misgivings ripened by experience, for I was certain that I would encounter what has become now a tradition of commencement in the Ivy League—namely, a ritual of flagellation.

In these presentiments I was proved quite right. At the same time, I know that my colleagues would show that beamish courtesy in which they have become practiced over the years, since the commencements were turned into "political" occasions more attuned to the temper of the young.

A standard part of these ceremonies has been the speech fashioned by a student to fit this formula: The College prides itself, falsely, on the engagements that take place in its classrooms, and in the absorption of its faculty in scholarship. When those bookish involvements are detached from the outside, political world, they become sterile exercises. But when these affectations of the College are put aside, everyone comes to realize that the real education is centered on those "personal relations" of "caring" by which we become "humans." As it turns out, the College has been clumsy in its efforts to arrange a setting that would be congenial to these lessons. The instruction has had to take place in the "interstices" of the life of the College; but at least it can be said that the College has done, less harm here than the other institutions of this society. And for that decent intention, the College earns at least our mild thanks. We wish it well; we shall look in now and then to see how it is doing; and we hope it may one day become as "good" a place as it aspires to be.

A BETTER EDUCATION?

The parents who take all of this in might be forgiven for wondering just what there was in this "experience" that warranted the \$40,000 they have paid over four years. Some of them might even be churlish enough to think that an even better education about "personal relations" in the real world might have been found in the "interstices" of a job. It may come as a surprise to them that these commencements no longer seem to celebrate scholarship, or that the College no longer esteems so unreservedly the notion of cultivating in its students cer-

tain habits of disciplined reflection. Without an esteem for these things, the justification for the College is called into question, and the parents are deprived, on this last day, of the grounds on which they and their children may at least congratulate themselves.

Some commentators have been moved recently to offer words of sympathy for those students who have opposed the granting of an honorary degree to U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick. One writer in the Washington Post remarked that the graduates make up a "captive audience," and they would be forced either to miss their graduation or "honor a person whose views they abhor." It has apparently escaped the notice of this sensitive man that faculty and parents are also captive audiences at these affairs, and for years they have been compelled to sit decorously while the school honors persons and causes they may regard as utterly thoughtless. Nor does it seem to be a matter of concern that these burdens are not distributed uniformly. There have been no protests over the awarding of degrees to Ralph Nader; no gestures of students rising to turn their backs on Benjamin Hooks and the policy of "racial balancing"; no threats of embarrassing scenes if Ramsey Clark should appear on the campus. Apparently there is a threat of disorder, and an offense to sensibilities, only at those rare moments when the College would honor someone who is mildly conservative or even traditionally liberal.

It is this shameless asymmetry in the bestowing of honors and the focusing of outrage that has made recent commencements, for many of us, such bitter occasions. The ceremonies have become converted into sectarian forms of political theater, in which one faction seeks a kind of moral coup d'état in world of speech. There are armbands, protests, insistent demands to be heard, even at the cost of unsettling the program—all for the sake of forcing others, finally, on some point, to acquiesce. In one tense moment at the Amherst commencement last year, a student who came to the stage for his diploma sought to pin an armband of protest on the president of the college. The armband was a symbol of opposition to investment in South Africa. In this awkward moment the president was forced to appear indifferent to the wrongs of South Africa in he held back from joining the protesters. The graduating seniors refuse to draw distinctions among themselves at these exercises according to the level of honors they have attained in their academic work. And yet they are strangely willing to imply the most pronounced moral distinctions on the question of South Africa: Apart from wearing armbands, the protesters often stand at a certain point in the ceremony and allow themselves to be seen. They allow themselves, that is, to be separated from their fellows and they suggest, in that way, the moral obtuseness or indifference of those who have not shared their gesture. Eventually the president could not bear the burden of this embarrassment, and he attached the armband to his robe—a move that elicited the applause that is usually conferred on the public display of "conviction."

My colleague Daniel Robinson has remarked that the armbands of protest will soon be sewn into the commencement gowns as part of the standard equipment. But for anyone journeying to New England and witnessing these displays, there is a sense of having left the world that most of us inhabit

and entering a land that time forgot. Where else but in the Ivy League would one discover, in 1982 and 1983, that South Africa is the preeminent moral issue in the world? Where else but in these academic enclaves would one find the persisting refusal to inquire into the grounds of principle on which we would object to the regime in South Africa—and to consider then whether those same standards of judgment would disclose to us comparable evils in other places, which may be every bit as much worthy of our concern as the wrongs that are revealed today in South Africa?

Is the problem of South Africa that blacks are ruled without their consent in a caste system? They happen to be ruled without their consent—without the benefit of free elections—almost everywhere else in black Africa. They are often ruled in a more lawless way, and with even fewer restraints on the use of force, than the restraints that still govern the regime in South Africa. That they are ruled in this way by other blacks should make no difference, at all, in principle to the wrong of ruling human beings as though they were horses or dogs; and it makes no difference in the quality of contempt felt by the rulers for those whom they are pleased to rule. And if our concern is that people are being ruled without their consent, why should the color of the victims make any difference? Why should we not be quite as concerned about the human beings who are being ruled without their consent in Vietnam, Cuba and the Soviet Union, in regimes that are even more stringent in their despotism and terroristic in their methods than the government in South Africa?

The students with armbands in the commencement of 1982 were expressing their anguish over South Africa only six months after martial law was imposed in Poland. Without much strain, on might have found, in the portfolio of the College, investments in firms that furnished loans and machinery to the Soviet Union and its satellites, and which helped to preserve this empire of repression as a solvent, ongoing enterprise. Did the College have any holdings in Chase Manhattan Bank or Citicorp? Did it own stock in Pullman, whose Kama River plant supplied the vehicles that would move the Red Army in the takeover of Afghanistan?

A TRUNCATED VIEW

That the protesters have not been much interested in these connections is an omission that cannot be laid merely to inconsistency. It is a reflection, rather, of a truncated view of the moral universe, and it should be apparent after a while that all the dramaturgy over South Africa—the clamorous insistence that raises this issue above all others—does not mark the presence of moral conviction. It conceals, instead, a want of confidence about the grounds of moral judgment, and the purpose of concentrating our attention is precisely to direct our critical gaze to questions that are safely distant from our own lives. In the commencement of 1982, the students of Georgetown University were encountering the exotic figure of Mother Theresa. She was, quite evidently, a stranger to their moral codes, and for that reason her remarks cut directly into their lives. To the occasional sound of remote, popping champagne corks, she urged young men and women "to love each other with a clean heart" and "give yourselves to each other a virgin heart." Her presence also recalled her moving pleas for the victims of abortion. At Amherst no attention was directed to the abortion clinic

just a mile down the road or to the role of the College in guiding its students toward these operations. That would have raised vexing disputes about the taking of human life, about the small killings that may have taken place close to the College, at the insistence of those who were now assembled to receive their degrees and offer their judgments to the world for its better ordering.●

IN MEMORY OF SUZETTE TAPPER

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, forward-looking politics lost one of its most committed and effective proponents on May 1, when Suzette Tapper died of a cerebral hemorrhage. For 20 years Suzette applied her wit and wisdom to the struggle for equal rights for women, environmental protection, and the increased use of renewable energy. Her career is an emblem of the efforts of the 1960's and 1970's to create a just, safe, and sustainable society.

She began working in the early 1960's as an organizer for the American Bar Association in Illinois, where she led the successful fight for the passage of the first Illinois judicial reform law. She married her husband, David, in 1966 in the home of Sam Witwer, on whose Senate campaign she was working at the time. When they moved to New York, Suzette began organizing for the National Organization for Women. She came up with the idea for a green T-shirt with the text of the equal rights amendment printed on the front—a T-shirt classic that raised money and consciousness.

Suzette organized more than political campaigns during this period. She coproduced three of David's documentary films. The last, "Bound for Freedom," the story of two British boys who were indentured servants until the age of 21. The film, which attempted to break through racial blinders to reveal the horrors of slavery, was shown on network television.

No one as committed as Suzette was to politics could avoid Washington forever, and in 1976 she moved to Washington to work as an organizer for Zero Population Growth. She moved over to Environmental Action next year, where she concentrated on mobilizing local environmental activism. Suzette's appetite for political challenges carried over into the rest of her life. In spite of a severe asthma condition, Suzette decided to learn to scuba dive while at Environmental Action. She took lessons, passed her exam, and enjoyed a view of the depths that no one else in her position would even have dreamed of.

Suzette's work at Environmental Action led her into the movement to develop renewable energy, and in 1980 she moved to Solar Lobby. True to form, Suzette took on the most difficult challenges. She lobbied for the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank, which would enable low-income people to borrow the money to make solar and conservation improvements in their homes, and the passive solar tax credit, which would stimulate the use of the most cost-effective solar technology. Thanks in large measure to Suzette's persistence, the Solar Bank will begin operating in a few weeks.

Perhaps even more important than Suzette's actual lobbying was the experience and good judgment she brought to planning Solar Lobby strategy. In a world of headstrong, hyperkinetic lobbyists, Suzette was the voice of planning. She knew that organizations with limited resources must use their time carefully. And she loved to talk politics.

Suzette's children, Seth and Gwen, are probably already brilliant political strategists because Suzette did not stop planning when she left the office. She talked to her children for hours about political intrigue. Seth and Gwen may already know more than they want to know about the power plays of American politics.

The thread that runs through all Suzette's activities is her desire to make ordinary people aware of their political rights and responsibilities. Her most recent projects at Solar Lobby were to revamp the activist network and to strengthen local involvement in the Solar Political Action Committee.

When someone dies, we always ask ourselves what that person would like us to do in her memory. Well, Suzette took care of that. When the Solar Lobby was cleaning out her desk, they found a familiar political button, yellow letters on a purple background: "Don't Mourn, Organize!"

IN HONOR OF THE TRICENTENNIAL YEAR OF GERMAN SETTLEMENT IN AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Concordia Society Germany-American Club of Waterbury, Conn. in my district, will be gathering on June 18 to celebrate a momentous occasion—300 years of German settlement in America. As my colleagues know, 1983 has been designated the "Tricentennial Anniversary Year of German Settlement in America" by Presidential proclamation. Be-

cause I am half German, I feel a special sense of excitement and pride at this occasion. The long, happy history of German settlement in America is indeed a cause for celebration, and also presents an important opportunity for all Americans to reflect on the tangible and intangible benefits our country has derived from all of its immigrants, and German-Americans in particular.

Germans began to emigrate to the United States in the 17th century. In the postcolonial period, Germany contributed more immigrants than any other country—over 6.9 million between 1820 and 1970. That is an astonishing 15 percent of the total number of immigrants to America. German immigrants tended to settle in the locations of greatest opportunity in this country, and began immediately to lend their industry and ingenuity to building the modern Nation. New York City, the port of entry for most immigrants, always contained the largest urban German concentration. But the large cities of the Midwest were to become the most characteristically German environments. In America's vast rural areas, German farmers were among the best and most productive in the country.

Germans in America duplicated the class, religious, and regional divisions of their homeland but managed also to retain an essential cultural unity. The transfer of diversity to their new homeland assured German-Americans a new culture which fostered achievement and upward mobility. Over the years German immigrants have been one of the groups most easily assimilated into American life while continuing to retain and share their rich heritage, and economic, political, scientific, and cultural insights.

All Americans continue to admire the skills, diligence, thrift, and family strength of German-Americans that characterized their earliest predecessors in this country. In this 300th year of German settlement, I join with all German-Americans and my friends in the Concordia Society, in the pride they feel in their long and fruitful history in America. Her future is made brighter by the presence of her German sons and daughters.●

ACID RAIN'S ENDANGERED SPECIES: COAL MINERS

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, for well over two centuries, the growth and prosperity of the United States has been fueled by the sacrifice of American coal miners who risked their lives to bring what we in coal country refer

to as "Black Gold" out of the ground and into the homes, factories, steel mills, powerplants, and railroad boilers.

For nearly a decade—under the slogan "An injury to one is an injury to all"—the United Mine Workers of America have fought to extend union protection to coal miners and their families. Safer working conditions, benefits from the Black Lung Act and fairer wages have all come about through the leadership and dedicated work of the UMWA.

Today, however, the mineworkers are striving to save jobs; an ever decreasing commodity in the coal industry. With over 33-percent unemployed in the industry today, the specter of an acid rain control program born out of political expediency lies ominously over the dreams and goals of the Nation's coal labor force and threatens to further increase their number on the unemployment rolls.

"Coal miners are particularly sensitive to environmental issues because we work in the most hostile and dangerous environment on Earth," UMWA President Rich Trumka said recently. Existing in such an area—working and raising their families in the coal producing regions of this country—indeed requires the mineworkers to be particularly sensitive to the quality of the environment. For the benefit of my colleagues, following is a column authored by the union's president and printed in the Beckley (West Virginia) Post Herald.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Post Herald, June 1, 1983]

BEYOND THE ACID RAIN SCARE

(By Richard L. Trumka)

Five hundred years ago everyone knew that the sun circled the earth. Galileo even faced excommunication for expressing his theory that the sun was the center of the solar system. A few years later, people began to question the fact that the earth was the hub of the universe. Then we learned the truth.

That is the nature of scientific progress—from false certainty to questioning, to new and more accurate knowledge. On the subject of acid deposition, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and a number of reputable atmospheric scientists have moved from the first stage to the second, and all of us should be grateful.

Current scientific knowledge is overwhelmingly uncertain. We do not know the cause of increasing acidity. We do not even know that acidity is increasing. We do not know what level of acidity is "normal." We do not fully understand the relative contribution of natural and man made sources of acidity. And, despite propaganda, we do not know if local or long distance sources of pollution are more important. Significantly, a study released in April by The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one by a Washington University professor issued in May, stress the relative importance of local sources.

There are many other things that we know. We know that there is no evidence that acid rain affects human health. We

know that the same New Englanders who want to tighten pollution controls in the Midwest want to ease them at home. We know that American pollution controls are stricter than those in Canada. We know that the worst single polluter in North America is Canada's Sudbury smelter. And we know that the area most affected by excess acidity in North America surrounds that Sudbury installation.

And that is only part of our knowledge. We know that the level of acidity historically has varied. Ages-old icebergs reveal higher acid content than we now have. The same was true of 17th century Paris. We know that acid levels never have been measured consistently over a long enough period to determine if significant changes have taken place. We know that IF—a very big IF—utility emissions are a major cause of rainfall acidity, the problem is self-correcting because of provisions in the Clean Air Act. The USEPA recently reported that emissions of sulfur dioxide declined by 27 percent from 1975 to 1981. And, as new power plants—which must meet even more stringent standards—replace older ones, that process will accelerate.

Most of all, we know that acid rain controls will have severe economic and employment impacts in the Midwest and parts of Appalachia. The U.S. Department of Energy recently estimated that 50 to 75 percent of the emissions reductions mandated by the proposals would be achieved by substituting low sulfur coal for high sulfur coal. If this fuel switching occurs, 40,000-80,000 coal industry employees could lose their jobs. In addition to the direct mining job losses, many thousand more workers in related industries and in the service sector would be affected. These job losses would occur in areas of the country that already suffer from near depression-level unemployment rates.

The total economic cost to the coal mining states that would be affected would be between three and six billion dollars. The social costs would be incalculable. Moreover, the problems created would not be short term. Many mining communities would never recover; they would become ghost towns. Meanwhile, the energy independence that is within our grasp never would occur. Instead, we would continue to mortgage our future to unstable and expensive foreign sources of energy.

Finally, we know that the propaganda being issued by organizations devoted to acid rain controls has been a disservice to the people of the United States. The people and organizations that have issued this propaganda are using unjustifiable scare tactics. These are reminiscent of the claims some years ago that Lake Erie already was dead and gone, irretrievable, because of pollution. Tell that to the people enjoying Lake Erie's many beautiful beaches today.

More than enough heat has been shed. Now it's time to spread some light.●

REGARDING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 22D AIR FORCE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to rise today to pay tribute to 25 years of service to

this Nation by those who serve at the headquarters of the 22nd Air Force, the control center for airlift operations around half the globe.

The 22d Air Force, whose headquarters has been at Travis Air Force Base in my congressional district since July 1, 1958, is one of two combat-ready airlift arms of the Airlift Command. On June 10 of this year, the 22d Air Force will recognize its anniversary in joint ceremonies with Travis Air Force Base, which is celebrating its 40 anniversary.

A statistical description of the 22d Air Force is impressive indeed. It employs roughly 38,000 military and civilian personnel, primarily in seven States and the Philippines. Moreover, it manages approximately 370 transport aircraft and support facilities, including 70 of the world's largest aircraft, the C-5A Galaxy aircraft.

The 22d also manages a versatile all-jet cargo fleet of C-141B Starlifters and C-130 Hercules aircraft, which can be used to airlift troops and supplies throughout the world in both war and peace time as needed. Some of the aircraft can even be reconfigured to act as flying hospital wards to evacuate and care for casualties in emergency situations.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the 22d Air Force has an exemplary record of responding rapidly and reliably to world problems, and handling even the most difficult assignments in a superior fashion. For example, Operation Homecoming was implemented by the 22d Air Force. As many of my colleagues may recall, Operation Homecoming was the name given to the Air Force's plan to bring home the Vietnam war POW's after the United States withdrew from the conflict in Southeast Asia, a difficult and sensitive assignment indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the 22d Air Force. I am proud of the well trained and highly motivated people who man the 22d and I am proud of its essential role in maintaining our Nation's military preparedness and thereby preserving our national security. I salute the headquarters of the 22d Air Force and the men and women who serve there.●

SCOTTSDALE HIGH SCHOOL 1922-83

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, last week, the oldest school in one of our Nation's fastest growing cities—Scottsdale High School of Scottsdale, Ariz.—graduated its last senior class after 60 years of operation. The historic school's closing this year marks the

end of an institution which represents a fulfilling education and life experience for some 10,000 graduates since its first class of three graduates in 1923, but Scottsdale High School will be remembered for more than its rewarding academic program.

When the school first opened in 1922, Scottsdale was an almost exclusively rural community separated from nearby Phoenix by unpaved roads, small farms, and sparse economic activity. Families sent their children to Tempe Normal School, now known as Arizona State University, for precollege schooling by apprentice teachers, for there were no other high schools in the area at the time. The community of Scottsdale had perhaps a few hundred residents then.

One longtime alumnus, Lester Mowry, who was in the school's first 4-year class of 1927—a total of 10 students—recalls that students had to carry their own seats for class in the school's auditorium.

Sixty years later, Scottsdale High School remains located in the heart of the downtown section of a city whose streets, buildings, and other famous standing structures are intertwined with the outskirts of the Phoenix metropolitan area, populated by almost 2 million people. The city of Scottsdale, one of our country's biggest tourist attractions due to its desert surroundings and old West setting, has about 100,000 residents and a growth-oriented economy that continues to foster change.

The growth of Scottsdale High School over the decades preceded the dramatic changes in the "Valley of the Sun," as the major influx of people first occurred in the 1950's, the same timeframe Scottsdale High was expanding into a district system of several schools. A farming community was beginning to turn into a residential community, and as the high school expanded, so did the whole area.

As the community expanded, the population spread out along with newer schools outside of the downtown area of Scottsdale. Because of declining enrollments, the local school board chose to close down the historic Scottsdale High, and it goes without saying that this was a difficult decision for many of the school's students, faculty and administration, and the list of accomplished alumni.

The real tributes to Scottsdale High School will remain in the memories of those who were associated with it, but I would like to share with my colleagues in Congress the May 27, 1983, news article, "Last Rite: Scottsdale High Closes With Class of 1983," printed in the Arizona Republic.

[From the Arizona Republic, May 27, 1983]
LAST RITE: SCOTTSDALE HIGH CLOSES WITH CLASS OF 1983

(By William La Jeunesse)

SCOTTSDALE.—For the Scottsdale High School graduating class of 1983, there will be no homecoming.

After 60 years of education and thousands of memories, Scottsdale High officially has closed.

On Thursday night, an audience of 2,000 jammed into Scottsdale High stadium to watch the 335 seniors of the class of '83 write the final chapter to this city's oldest high school.

"I feel very unique to be recognized and remembered," Ronda Johnston, 18, said. "I am glad to graduate but sad because I know ours is the last generation of so many that have passed through here, and I don't want the tradition to die."

"I always hoped that I could bring my kids here and show them where I went to high school and that they could go here."

"But the saddest thing is we have no homecoming to come home to."

The school board voted Jan. 18 to close Scottsdale High because of declining enrollment.

"Whether these buildings stand or not, Scottsdale High will always be with you," an emotional Evelyn Caskey, Scottsdale High principal, told the graduates.

It was a bittersweet ending for the high school, teachers and students. The 36-acre Scottsdale High site is in the center of downtown. With a price tag estimated at \$20 million, the buildings are expected to be leveled to make room for an office building or hotel-convention center complex.

More than 70 Scottsdale teachers and about 900 students will be transferred to the district's other four high schools next fall.

As for the graduates Thursday night, they said they were happy to graduate and embark on new challenges but sad to see their alma mater close.

"SHS was a second home and a place to grow," Roxanne Gentry, student-body president, said in her graduation-night speech. "Above all, it was a great education."

"As the closure lurked upon us, the truth became clear. In five short months, our alma mater would cease to exist. We proud seniors on this proud night are feeling excitement, maturity and the expectations of our dreams. So go, fellow classmates, and fulfill your dreams."

Kymberly Leicht, the senior-class president, added, "It feels like the beginning of my life, but I know it is also an end."

"I know I can never come back . . . to see all these friends again. Underneath all these smiles, there is sadness. SHS has been good to all of us."

The commencement address was delivered by Mark Scharenbroich, youth-development manager at Josten's, a ring-marketing company.

"The two greatest things a parent can give a child is roots and wings," Scharenbroich told the audience.

"To you parents," he said, "it is time to let go of that little hand."

"To you graduates, always cherish your family. Your gift to them is your honest appreciation of their love. When these ceremonies end, wrap your arms around them. Never be embarrassed to show love for your family."

The school band played Aaron Copland's Fanfare for the Common Man, which was followed by brief addresses by school board President Sue Doggett and Superintendent

Phil Gates, who said, "Goodbye, good luck and God bless."●

THE SITUATION IN GUATEMALA—PART II

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in his speech on Central America last month, President Reagan said that, "We do not view security assistance as an end in itself, but as a shield for democratization, economic development, and diplomacy."

It is the reality which lies behind that shield in Central America, however, that raises serious questions about the administration's policies in that region and their chances of success over the long run. Nowhere is this more so than in Guatemala.

The Reagan administration moved closer to the Ríos Montt government after that regime came to power in a coup in March 1982. The United States increased foreign assistance and the Guatemalan Government was allowed to purchase military equipment from us for the first time since 1977. The administration wants Congress to approve \$50 million in security-related aid for fiscal year 1984, an increase of about 400 percent.

The United States improved relations with Guatemala despite credible reports that the Guatemalan Government was carrying out a campaign of destruction, terror, and death against Guatemalan Indians and peasants in the countryside. Amnesty International, for example, reported that Guatemalan forces massacred more than 2,600 Indians and peasant farmers in a new counterinsurgency program launched after Gen. Efraín Ríos Montt came to power.

The brutal nature of the regime that emerges from these reports raises basic questions about U.S. policy there: Is it in our interests to support a government that makes war on its own people? Can such policy succeed over the long run?

Two recent articles describe in detail the situation that exists behind the administration's shield in Guatemala. I recommend them to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 1983]

IN AMERICA'S NAME

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON, March 12.—What follows is for readers with strong stomachs.

"We were told again and again of government soldiers, in uniform, arriving at a village, rounding up men and women and shooting them."

"But they apparently don't waste bullets on children. They pick them up by the feet and smash their heads against a wall. Or they tie ropes around their necks and pull them until they are strangled. We heard of

children being thrown in the air and bayoneted."

That is not a description of what happened in Cambodia years ago under the genocide regime of Pol Pot. It is an account of what is being done right now by the Government of Guatemala—a government that has the support of the President of the United States.

The account comes from a New York lawyer, Stephen L. Kass, who has just been interviewing refugees from Guatemala. He and another specialist in Latin American affairs, Robert L. Goldman, professor of international law at American University, went to southern Mexico to speak with refugees who had recently crossed the border.

Can such horror stories really be true? I asked Mr. Kass.

"We were told this kind of thing over and over along the border," he answered. "We were told it by men, we were told it by women, we were told it by children—at different places, by people who could not have known each other."

The two lawyers, who were looking into the situation for the Americas Watch Committee, interviewed refugees in Spanish at the Pacific Ocean end of the Mexican-Guatemalan border. Then they flew to airstrips in a mountainous jungle region to visit two refugee camps a mile or two from the central part of the border.

Between 50,000 and 80,000 Guatemalan peasants have fled across the border in the last year or so. The flow is continuing—several thousand have come into organized refugee camps in the last two months.

"We believe there is a continuing pattern of almost indiscriminate violence directed at Indian peasant communities," Mr. Kass said. "Any village regarded by the local army commander as not firmly supportive of government efforts to destroy subversion is regarded as subversive itself—and, as such, a free-fire zone."

"It is a level of butchery that seems unimaginable but is true."

"When survivors from these villages try to live in the hills, the army destroys their crops. We heard that repeatedly, again from many different people. Helicopters are used to patrol the tillable areas and fire on people who try to grow things."

"And in our conversations with even the poorest Indians, they knew the United States supplied the helicopters and supported this government."

General Efraín Ríos Montt installed himself as president of Guatemala in a coup last March. When President Reagan toured Latin America last year, he met General Ríos Montt and rejected criticism of Guatemala's human rights record. "Frankly," Mr. Reagan said, "I'm inclined to believe they've been getting a bum rap." The Administration then announced that Guatemala would be allowed to buy spare parts for helicopters and aircraft, after years of embargo.

The reality of what government forces do in Guatemala—or for that matter the El Salvador Army's continuing butchery of civilians—contrasts almost comically with the noble images President Reagan evoked in asking Congress to send more military aid to Salvador. Our goal in Central America, he said, is "to replace poverty with development and dictatorship with democracy." We insist on a "legitimate road to power," not rule "without the consent of the people."

If the Reagan Administration were candid with the American people about its policy in Central America, it would say something like this:

"The governments we support in Guatemala and El Salvador do not live up to our most modest idea of decency. They murder their own citizens in large numbers, and the few rich brutally oppress the many poor. Moreover, they pay little attention to our views. Guatemala won't even let the International Red Cross look at its prisoners, and El Salvador has not convicted one official for the thousands of murders. But they are our allies against communism. They serve our strategic interest, and that is why we must support them."

The Administration will not say that—because Americans would not stand for it. We are not that kind of people. We do not want such horrors condoned in our name: not even to put down communism—if the policy would, which it will not.

And I wonder about Ronald Reagan. There is a real possibility that he believes all those hypocritical statements about how Central America would be fine if only the Communists left it alone. If he knew what was happening—if he knew that children were being murdered—would he actually want to pay that price?

[From the New Republic, Apr. 11, 1983]

THE GUNS OF GUATEMALA—THE MERCILESS MISSION OF RÍOS MONTT'S ARMY

(By Allan Nairn)

On April 20, 1982, government troops entered the village of Acul in Guatemala's northwest highlands. According to an eyewitness, "They searched the houses and pulled the people out, and took us to the churchyard. The lieutenant walked up and down, pointing at people, saying these will go to hell, these will go to heaven. The ones he said would go to hell they took out to be shot. They tied them up and kicked them and gave them karate chops to the throat. One soldier had a big knife and he stuck it into their genitals and hacked them on the neck and on the back. The people were crying and crossing themselves. The soldiers pulled out one boy and put him up against the big tree. They said they were going to shoot him because he was against the government. They took the others to the cemetery with their hands tied behind their backs. They dug a big ditch and lined them up at the edge. We all had to come and watch. The lieutenant said they were going to be shot because 'you haven't educated your children, your children are going around with scum, and that doesn't suit us. But we're not going to throw their bodies on the roadside, we're just going to shoot them.' He said this was the new law of Ríos Montt. They shot each one with a bullet in the face from about a meter away. Parts of their brains spilled out and scattered into the ditch." By the end of the day twenty-four lay dead. The next day the troops killed twenty-two more.

According to figures compiled by Amnesty International, at least 12,000 unarmed civilians have died by violence in Guatemala since 1978. Last year Amnesty reported that 2,600 had been killed between July and March 23, when General Efraín Ríos Montt seized power in a military coup. By December, however, army massacres had become more sporadic and the pace of guerrilla raids had slackened. These developments were widely interpreted to mean that the government had begun to curb human rights abuses and had succeeded in crushing the guerrillas.

The interpretation was wrong on both counts. The number of massacres fell because the army had completed the first

stage of a major operation designed to depopulate the rural villages that are the guerrillas' logistical and political base. The guerrilla's level of activity fell because their village support network had been disrupted. During this operation, I conducted interviews with several dozen soldiers and officers in the field, as well as with refugees and government officials. What they said points to the conclusion that Ríos Montt's strategy was based on organized killing, torture, and bombing of unarmed civilians—a round of carnage that can be expected to resume as soon as guerrilla activity reaches a sufficiently threatening level. And far from crushing the guerrillas, the counterinsurgency drive has left their corps of armed combatants essentially intact, while sowing bitterness among the peasant survivors.

Ríos Montt, who was trained in counterinsurgency at Fort Bragg and served in 1973 as director of studies at the Pentagon's Inter-American Defense College in Washington, D.C., brought the Guatemalan Army back into the mainstream of international counterinsurgency theory. General Romeo Lucas García, whom Ríos Montt toppled in the coup, had attempted to fight the guerrillas with an uncoordinated series of rural massacres. In the urban areas, Lucas undertook a campaign of assassinations that destroyed a powerful popular movement of trade unionists, professionals, clergy, students, slum dwellers, and moderate politicians; he recklessly continued these highly visible killings long after their political objective had been accomplished. Besides bringing international condemnation of Guatemala's human rights abuses, Lucas's actions actually increased guerrilla strength.

Ríos Montt curtailed the politically disastrous urban assassinations. He shifted to a program of centralized planning, local and international public relations, and, as an army strategy document put it, "establishment of a scheme for control of the population"—forced labor "civil patrols" used for road repair, surveillance, and army-led military forays. The cutting edge of the strategy was a series of province-by-province sweeps by massed troops to clear the tiny mountain villages and to resettle much of the population in army-controlled towns. The sweeps concentrated the killing in a few brief but fierce bursts. After the phalanx had run out of villages in one region and moved on to the next, it could be said that violence in the first region had diminished and human rights improved. By October this claim could be made for the country as a whole.

As the sweeps began, in the provinces of Chimaltenango and Alta Verapaz and Baja Verapaz, the level of killing—the highest in Guatemalan history—shocked even traditionally reserved elements of the local establishment. "Not even the lives of old people, pregnant women, or innocent children were respected," said Guatemala's Conference of Catholic Bishops in a May 27 pastoral letter. "Never in our history has it come to such grave extremes." In an unprecedented series of editorials in May, the conservative *El Gráfico*, the country's leading newspaper, stated: "Massacres have become the order of the day. . . . How is it possible to behead an 8- and 9-year-old child? . . . We do not deserve aid as long as this keeps occurring."

At the same time, the United States Embassy was assuring visitors that human rights conditions had dramatically improved and that if abuses were occurring they were

contrary to policy. By way of proof, they distributed copies of the army's "Code of Conduct Toward the Civil Population," twelve-point guide to counterinsurgency etiquette that admonishes soldiers not to "flirt or take liberties with the women," and to "show special affection and respect for the aged and children."

On May 24 Ríos Montt set the stage for the sweeps through Quiché and Huehuetenango, the provinces with the heaviest guerrilla activity, by announcing that he would grant amnesty to all guerrillas and collaborators who turned themselves in before July 1. After the amnesty had expired, and residents of a village believed to be collaborating with the guerrillas would be considered fair game. On June 30 Ríos Montt declared on television that "today we are going to begin a merciless struggle," and issued a decree that ordered all men age 18 to 30 to present themselves for military service. The decree stated that the army would "proceed with a vigorous and firm military action to annihilate the subversion that has not understood the good intentions of the government."

According to soldiers and officers who participated in the action last July, August, and September, the sweeps were directed not at armed guerrillas but at civilians in villages suspected of guerrilla collaboration. Ríos Montt had outlined the rationale in a May 17 interview. "The problem of the war," he explained, "is not just a question of who is shooting. For each one who is shooting, there are ten working behind him."

According to Lieutenant Romero Sierra, who commands a 20-man patrol base at La Perla, a northwest highlands plantation, the sweeps were directed from the top. Field commanders like Sierra receive their orders through a chain of command which places only three steps—the minister of defense, the army chief of staff, and a colonel in the provincial capital—between themselves and Ríos Montt. The commander received daily orders from the colonel, and maintain hourly radio contact with his headquarters. "I advise him that 'I'm going to Tutzuil with twenty men.' He knows everything. Everything is controlled." All field actions must be reported in the commanders' daily "diary of operations," which is reviewed and criticized in monthly face-to-face evaluations. "We're on a very short leash," Sierra said.

Sierra, who directed the sweeps through his patrol area of 20 square kilometers and 10,000 people, told me that thousands of civilians were displaced but that "in the time I've been here [two-and-a-half months] no subversives have fallen. Lots of unarmed people, women refugees, but we haven't had actual combat with guerrillas."

Each patrol officer, after describing the success of his sweep, would casually point to this local mountain and say that 50 to 75 guerrilla combatants were still at large. Lieutenant Sierra estimated that 70 guerrillas were moving in the mountains immediately surrounding La Perla. "There are lots of them around here," said Miguel Raimundo, a sergeant in Nebaj, a medium-sized army-occupied town south of La Perla. "It's hard to fight them. There are about 300 of them—the ones who fight."

Just outside Nebaj, more than 2,500 peasants had been resettled on an army airstrip. "They didn't want to leave voluntarily," explained Felipe, a corporal who manned the 50-caliber machine gun that dominated the town from the church belfry. "The government put out a call that they would have

one month to turn themselves in. So now the army is in charge of going to get all the people from all these villages."

Sergeant Miguel Raimundo, who was guarding a group of 161 suspected guerrilla collaborators (which included 79 children and 42 women), said, "The problem is that almost all the village people are guerrillas." According to camp records, these peasants had been rounded up in army sweeps through the villages of Vijolom, Salquil Grande, Tjolom, Parramos Chiquito, Paob, Vixaj, Quejchip, and Xepium. Sergeant José Angel, who commands a 40-man platoon based at La Perla, explained the procedure. "Before we get to the village, we talk with the soldiers about what they should do and what they shouldn't do. They all discuss it so they have it in their minds. We coordinate it first—we ask, what is our mission?"

According to José Angel, "One patrol enters the village from one point, on another side another patrol enters. We go in before dawn, because everyone is sleeping. If we come in broad daylight they get scared, they see it's the army, and they run because they know the army is coming to get them."

The army has a policy about such behavior. "The people who are doing things outside the law run away," the sergeant said. "But the people who aren't doing anything, they stay." He said he had seen cases where "lots of them ran, most of a village. They ran because they knew the army was coming."

Miguel Raimundo cited three cases where villagers fled en masse. "All the villages around here, like Salquil, Palob, or here in Sumal, they have a horn and there's a villager who watches the road. If the soldiers come, he blows the horn. It's a signal. They all go running."

For the soldiers, the killing of fleeing, unarmed civilians has become a matter of routine. I asked Felipe, the Nebaj corporal, how the villagers react when the troops arrive.

"They flee from their homes. They run for the mountain."

"And what do you do?"

"Some we capture alive and others we can't capture alive. When they run and go into mountains that obligates one to kill them."

"Why?"

"Because they might be guerrillas. If they don't run, the army is not going to kill them. It will protect them."

"Among those you have to kill, what kind of people are they? Are they men or women?"

"At times men, at times women."

"In which villages has this happened?"

"Oh, it's happened in lots of them. In Acul, Salquil, Sumal Chiquito, Sumal Grande."

"In those villages, about how many people did you kill?"

"Not many, a few."

"More than ten? More than twenty? More than a hundred?"

"Oh no, about twenty."

"In each village?"

"Yes, of course. It's not many. More than that were captured alive."

José Angel, the sergeant at La Perla, recalled a similar experience in the village of Chumansan in the province of Quezaltenango. "When we went in, the people scattered," he said. "We had no choice but to shoot at them. We killed some. . . . Oh, about ten, no more. Most of them got away."

According to accounts from soldiers and survivors, the army follows a consistent

step-by-step procedure after entering a village. First, Sergeant José Angel explained, "We go into a village and take the people out of their houses and search the houses." Among the items the soldiers look for are suspiciously large stocks of grain or beans. The army takes what it can use and burns the rest. Next, he said, "You ask informers who are the ones that are doing things, things outside the law. And that's when you round up the collaborators. And the collaborators—you question them, interrogate them, get them to speak the truth. Who have they been talking to? Who are the ones who have been coming to the village to speak with them?"

The interrogations are generally conducted in the village square with the entire population looking on. I asked José Angel how he questioned people. He replied, "Beat them to make them tell the truth, hurt them."

"With what methods?"

"This one, like this [he wraps his hands around his neck and makes a choking sound]. More or less hanging them."

"With what?"

"With a lasso. Each soldier has his lasso."

The day before, in Nebaj, an infantryman who was standing over the bodies of four guerrillas who had been executed a few hours before demonstrated the interrogation technique he had learned in "Cobra," an army counterinsurgency course for field troops. "Tie them like this," he said, "tie the hands behind, run the cord here [around the neck] and press with a boot [on the chest]. Knot it, and make a tourniquet with a stick, and when they're dying you give it another twist and you ask them again, and if they still don't want to answer you do it again until they talk." According to sergeants and infantrymen of Nebaj and La Perla, the tourniquet is the most common interrogation technique. Live burial and mutilation by machete are also used.

The director of an ambulance squad in one of Guatemala's largest provinces said that roughly 80 percent of the bodies recovered by his unit have their hands tied behind their backs and show signs of strangulation. The bodies are usually naked and have been finished off by 5.56 millimeter bullets (the kind used in the army's assault rifles) fired at close range into the chest, or by puncture wounds to the neck, generally consisting of four intersecting slices, characteristic of the army's four-flanged bayonet.

The soldiers said they expect those they question to provide specific information, such as the names of villagers who have talked with or given food to guerrillas. Failure to do so implies guilt, and brings immediate judgment and action. "Almost everyone in the villages is a collaborator," said Sergeant Miguel Raimundo. "They don't say anything. They would rather die than talk."

When I asked Miguel Raimundo about the interrogation method, he replied: "We say, if you tell us where the guerrillas are, the army won't kill you. . . . If they collaborate with the army, we don't do anything."

"And if they don't say anything?"

"Well, then they say, 'if you kill me, kill me—because I don't know anything,' and we know they're guerrillas. They prefer to die rather than say where the compañeros are."

According to Sergeant José Angel, it is common for suspected collaborators to be pointed out, questioned, and executed all on the same day. Explaining how he extracted information so quickly, he said, "Well, they

don't talk like that voluntarily. You just have to subdue them a little to make them speak the truth."

After the interrogations have been completed, the patrol leader makes a speech to the survivors gathered in the village square.

"We tell the people to change the road they are on, because the road they are on is bad," said José Angel. "If they don't change, there is nothing else to do but kill them."

"So you kill them on the spot?"

"Yes, sure. If they don't want the good, there's nothing more to do but bomb their houses."

José Angel said he had participated in operations of this kind in the provinces of Sololá and Quezaltenango in which more than 500 people were killed. He and other soldiers said that smaller villages are destroyed with Spanish, Israeli, and U.S.-made grenades. Boxes of these grenades could be seen stacked in the Nebaj ammunition dump. The soldiers said they also used a 3.5-inch U.S.-made shoulder-held recoilless rocket that was designed as an antitank weapon but is effective against people and straw huts. At the La Perla headquarters, one such launcher was sitting next to boxes of "explosive projectile" rockets from the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant.

For larger operations, José Angel said, patrols called in army planes and helicopters to bomb the villages. The helicopters are U.S.-manufactured Hueys and Jet Rangers. (Until January 1983, when the State Department rescinded the Carter Administration's 1977 ban, the sale of spare parts for the helicopters had been withheld on human rights grounds.) The bombs include U.S.-made 50-kilogram M1/61As, twelve of which were stacked in the base munitions dump in Nebaj. José Angel said he had seen such bombs dropped from Huey helicopters in Pujujil and the surrounding cantons in Sololá. The ambulance squad leader cited six cases in his province where survivors told of being bombed from planes and from blue and white (the color of the Jet Rangers) helicopters. He said he had observed craters, shattered houses, and trees marked with heavy shrapnel. On December 8, at the graduation ceremonies of the Military Aviation School, the army gave a public demonstration of bombing from Huey helicopters.

The American Embassy would neither confirm nor deny that U.S. helicopters were being used for bombing, but a senior diplomat said that if they were, it would not be a violation of U.S. intent. "If you're engaged in a war, you bomb and you strafe," the official said. "If you have a fort you've got to take out, you save lives. That's what we did in World War I and World War II."

Some Guatemalan officers contend that although helicopters are widely used for bombing, they are of greater tactical importance for surprise entry. "When you go in on foot," said Lieutenant Cesar Bonilla, the officer in charge of the villagers resettled at the Nebaj airstrip, "they see the patrol three kilometers away and know you're coming. But with air transport, you land different units in the area, all the units close in rapidly, and the people can't go running away."

Bonilla said that this type of operation could only be executed by several helicopters at once. "With just one helicopter you scare them away and there's no control." The United States' refusal to sell spare parts had grounded much of the fleet, so Lieutenant Bonilla was encouraged by reports that the Reagan Administration was considering a change in policy. "That would

be wonderful," he said. "With six helicopters, for example, the airborne troops would land all at once before they could make a move. The nicest, the ideal, the dream, would be a surprise: suddenly, pow! Helicopters with troops!" As he spoke, he made machine-gun noises and waved his Galil toward the refugee shacks. "Ta, ta, ta, ta, ta! All at once from the air! Pow! No escape routes. That would be ideal."

The day before this conversation, a peasant family in Bonilla's camp, interviewed in their shack outside the view of soldiers, described such an assault on their village. "Two times they came there in helicopters," said one of the men. "They would come in and land and the people would retire and they would always kill a few. They flew over, machine-gunning people from the helicopter." The family said that five were killed in the strafing.

This family, like its neighbors, was moved out of its village and told that the army would provide for its security, food, and housing. This is the "beans" component of General Ríos Montt's heralded "beans and rifles" program. Removed from their houses and fields, the people must depend on the army. Such relocations are a standard counterinsurgency tactic. Ríos Montt, however, has succeeded in portraying them as part of an economic reform program. The relocations make the army the well-publicized partner of international organizations that answer the government's plea to aid the villagers. Many foreign observers, unfamiliar with how and why the army resettled the people, are impressed by the sight of an army feeding and housing a peasantry it has been accused of massacring.

By September the sweep was coming to an end, and the next stage of the operation was beginning. "Up here there aren't any villages anymore," said José Angel, speaking of the patrol areas around La Perla. "There used to be, but then the soldiers came. We knew that such and such a village was involved, so we went to get them. We captured some and the rest of the people from the village ran away. They're hiding in the mountains. Now we're going to the mountains to look for them."

Going into the mountains to track down refugees meant going to guerrilla territory. According to the soldiers and refugees who have come down from the mountains, many villages fleeing the army wander through the hills alone, armed only with machetes and an occasional hunting shotgun. But some make contact with guerrilla patrols that act as their guides, sometimes sending them toward the relative safety of the Mexican border.

In some regions, the army has abandoned armed pursuit in favor of a strategy of waiting until hunger and disease flush out the villagers, who must live off weeds, roots, and quick-growing vegetables while staying constantly on the move. This tactic scored its first major success in mid-October, when several thousand refugees from the San Martín Jilotepeque area in Chimaltenango, many of whom had been in the hills since February following a series of massacres during the Lucas period, came down and surrendered to the army, asking for food. Nobody knows how many refugees are in the mountains. In May, before the Quiché and the Huehuetenango sweeps, the Conference of Catholic Bishops estimated that the number of refugees (not all of whom are living in the mountains) exceeded one million. Guatemala's total population is seven million.

Major Tito Arís, commander of the Nebaj base, said in mid-September that 2,000 people from the area of Sumal Grande had fled to the mountains and would be pursued by foot patrols and helicopters. Sergeant José Angel said his platoon went on such operations frequently. I asked José Angel what his troops did when they find refugees.

"At times we don't find them. We see them but they get away."

"But when you do find them, what do you do?"

"Oh, we kill them."

"Are they a few people or entire villages?"

"No, entire villages. When we entered the villages we killed some and the rest ran away."

Under the army's policy, a peasant found outside the army-controlled towns can be in mortal danger. "We know the poor people from close up and far away," said Sergeant Miguel Raimundo. "If we see someone walking in the mountains, that means he is a subversive. So we try to grab him and ask where he's going; we arrest him. And then we see if he is a guerrilla or not. But those who always walk in the mountains, we know they are guerrillas. Maybe some of them will be children, but we know that they are subversive delinquents. I've been walking in the mountains for a year now, and just in the mountains, one by one, we've captured more than 500 people."

Like his fellow sergeants and lieutenants, Miguel Raimundo is comfortable with the army's assumptions. "A woman told me yesterday that the soldiers kill people, that the soldiers killed her husband. But I told her that if the soldiers killed her husband it was because he was a guerrilla. The soldier knows whom to kill. He doesn't kill the innocent, just the guilty. And she said, 'No, my husband wasn't doing anything.' So I said, 'And how do you know it was nothing? How do you know what he was doing outside?' 'No,' she said, 'because he never went anywhere.' 'Yes,' I said, 'That's because he was a collaborator.'"

It is possible that Ríos Montt's strategy will succeed in isolating and demoralizing the guerrillas. But it is more likely that it will end up strengthening them. For all the relative sophistication of Ríos Montt's approach, it has relied largely on violence directed at the civilian population. And it was such violence, after all, that made the guerrillas a threat in the first place. In 1967 and 1968, the Guatemalan Army, assisted by U.S. advisers, did succeed in defeating the guerrillas of the eastern provinces of Zacapa and Izabal with a campaign that took 5,000 to 10,000 civilian lives. But those insurgents numbered only a few hundred and were poorly organized. By 1978 the guerrillas had reorganized, established political links with the peasantry, and expanded their combat force. When the army began killing peasants whom speculators were evicting from the land, the guerrillas were ready to take advantage of the resulting popular resentment. It was Lucas's counterinsurgency campaign that made the difference. His massacres and assassinations sent the guerrillas waves of new recruits and transformed them from a militarily marginal force into a powerful movement.

Severe as Lucas's spasms of violence were, however, they pale in comparison to the death and dislocation sown by Ríos Montt's systematic sweeps. Today there are tens of thousands of Guatemalans roaming the mountainsides and living in the villages and camps who have lost husbands, wives, par-

ents, children, friends, and homes, and who carry with them graphic memories of a brutal encounter with their government. Ríos Montt's destruction of the rural social structure has set back the guerrillas, but has left them alive to organize and fight another day.

On March 23, the anniversary of his coup, Ríos Montt modified the state of siege. Speaking on television in the wake of the Pope's visit, the General, who is an evangelical Protestant, said, "We know and understand that we have sinned, that we have abused power, and we want to reconcile ourselves with the people." Ríos Montt has talked this way before, even while directing the bloodiest of his military campaigns. And it is hard to see how any kind of reconciliation can be achieved without the kind of basic political and economic changes that have been steadfastly resisted ever since a C.I.A.-sponsored coup brought the military to power in 1954. It is equally hard to see how such changes can be made as long as the army and the oligarchs continue to rule.

Neither Efraín Ríos Montt nor the officers and politicians constantly plotting to replace him can expect ultimately to achieve a military victory. They are more likely to find themselves on a downward spiral—having to kill more and more to stave off the consequences of the killing they have done before. Whether the guerrillas succeed in using this situation to fashion a victory of their own is another question. But it appears that given the logic of the Guatemalan struggle, the war is theirs for the losing. ●

FOOD IRRADIATION

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to share with you and my colleagues a very remarkable technological achievement by my constituents. The Albuquerque office of CH2M Hill, the Nation's sixth largest consulting engineering firm, was recently awarded the American Consulting Engineers Council's Honor Award for its newly developed food irradiation process.

CH2M Hill is to be commended for this accomplishment. Their process is doubly beneficial, for it not only treats food but also helps reduce nuclear waste. Called byproducts utilization, it derives beneficial uses from nuclear waste through low-level doses of gamma radiation from cesium-137 to disinfect fruit, control trichina in pork, and preserve foods.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my congratulations to CH2M Hill for the remarkable achievement which is more fully described in an article from the firm's spring 1983 reports.

FOOD IRRADIATION USING NUCLEAR BYPRODUCTS TO DESTROY PESTS AND PARASITES

(By Serge Gregory)

Radioactive wastes are usually considered a dangerous byproduct of nuclear technology. But that isn't the whole story. These wastes have provided the heat to generate

power in remote locations, a source of light where external power sources are not available, and the means to disinfect municipal sewage sludge. Now fresh foods are being irradiated to make them safer for human consumption.

LOW DOSES

Irradiation may seem an unlikely method of preventing contamination. However, a low dose of ionizing energy can inhibit sprouting in onions and potatoes, destroy insects that infest fruit and slow down the ripening process—all without making the food radioactive or changing its flavor.

This technology was originally developed in the United States in the late 1940s, but was stifled in 1958 by a regulatory ruling that classified irradiation as an additive rather than as a process like boiling or freezing. Researchers had a difficult time testing irradiation using the same techniques required for testing food additives.

Since then, safety testing technology and scientists' understanding of radiation chemistry have advanced significantly. In 1980, after 25 years of research, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration proposed a regulation stating that food irradiated with low doses (less than 100 kilorads) be considered safe for human consumption.

NOW IN USE

That same year, a World Health Organization expert committee recommended that foods treated with doses up to 1,000 kilorads be considered safe. Many nations, including Japan, the Netherlands and the Soviet Union, now use this technology as a means of increasing food shelf life and inhibiting sprouting. As an added advantage, components of existing nuclear wastes can be used, eliminating the need to store them.

The U.S. Department of Energy has developed a Byproducts Utilization Program to promote the beneficial use of wastes from plutonium production. One such application is the use of gamma radiation from cesium-137 for food irradiation. CH2M HILL has been assisting the Department of Energy in identifying and developing these technologies, and in making them available to potential users (see Reports, Winter 1980).

"Food irradiation has attracted a lot of attention recently and shows significant promise," said Scott Ahlstrom, deputy program director of CH2M HILL at the firm's Albuquerque, New Mexico, office. "So, we're helping develop a variety of applications, including controlling trichina in fresh pork and disinfecting citrus fruits and apples."

PORK

The project team is working with several universities, government laboratories and the National Pork Producers Council to study the feasibility of using irradiation to eliminate trichina in pork. (Trichina is a parasite that can grow in humans.) The pork industry has set itself the task of ensuring that fresh pork is trichina-safe by 1987.

Industry conditions are being simulated at Sandia National Laboratories' irradiation facilities in Albuquerque. The effectiveness and economic feasibility of implementing a large-scale pork irradiation program are being verified.

FRUIT

CH2M Hill has also developed the conceptual design for a transportable irradiator. Such a facility will support U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) research on irradiation as an alternative to pesticides and fumigants.

For example, Florida currently controls fruit flies in citrus fruits prior to export by fumigating the fruit with ethylene dibromide (EDB). The Environmental Protection Agency has identified EDB as a suspected carcinogen and now plans to bar its use as a fumigant. As a result, the USDA is investigating irradiation as an energy-efficient alternative to cold storage and vapor-heat treatment when EDB is banned.

Significant foreign markets have embargoed the importation of apples from Washington because of the presence of codling moths in that state. With the development of the transportable irradiator, the USDA will be able to test the effectiveness of irradiation in controlling this destructive pest, as well as pests in other states, without having to build separate facilities. In addition, the transportable device enables food processors to test the irradiation process at their existing facilities in the way it would be used if implemented.

GREATER ACCEPTANCE

These programs are demonstrating that irradiation is a safe, efficient method of reducing reliance on potentially hazardous chemicals.

But Jacek Sivinski, CH2M HILL's program director, sees even greater international implications. "Food quarantine barriers now limit trade among nations," said Sivinski. "Many exports now on the 'block' list could be made safe for import by countries that are seeking these foods on the world market."

THE TRADE CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1983

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1983

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have opposed the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to non-market-economy countries which have historically maintained oppressive human rights and emigration policies or which have demonstrated a national policy of unfair and predatory trade practices. I opposed the granting of MFN status to the People's Republic of China because of the certain knowledge that China would use the relaxed access to our domestic markets in order to exploit artificial price differentials between China's economy and our own. History has proved that industries targeted by nonmarket-economic systems cannot long withstand the pressure.

The phenomenon is not limited to China or to other Communist countries. As the trend toward nationalized industries continues in hitherto capitalist, market economies, the difficulty in maintaining a level playing field in our domestic markets is exacerbated. We have seen the Socialist Government in France carry out its campaign promises to nationalize the major banks and many major industries. We have seen the European steel industry cartelized not only within individual countries, but throughout Europe as

political demands cause politicians to throw sound economic judgment to the winds in order to assure stability of ballot box results.

The bottom line for American business is that our trade laws simply do not do what the Congress intended that they do. Where there is a wrong, our current statutes are ineffectual in righting the wrong. This is especially true with respect to nonmarket economies, and will be increasingly true with respect to trading partners which have characteristics of nonmarket economies in some of their industrial sectors. This bill, H.R. 3227, addresses the problems inherent in current trade law with respect to making pricing determinations in trade actions, and modifies the remedy rules in other important ways.

This legislation proposes a simple and speedy alternative to the tangled remedies presently available in our antidumping laws to domestic industries who have experienced market disruptions due to large numbers of imports priced below fair market value.

Our current trade laws offer a domestic manufacturer two remedies against such an influx of injurious imports from nonmarket economies: the Antidumping Act and section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The Antidumping Act is aimed at unfairly designated law prices. "Dumping" is determined by comparing the price the foreign manufacturer charges in its own country with the price that same manufacturer is charging for its product in the United States; if the foreign producer's U.S. price is lower than the price in the producer's country—after adjustments for shipping costs, duties, et cetera, is considered—the foreign manufacturer is dumping. Thus, a special duty can be charged to offset the amount by which the foreign producer is dumping products in the United States.

However, with respect to nonmarket economies, it is generally conceded that the home market price is meaningless. The prices and costs in non-market economies are typically set for political, rather than economic reasons. Neither free-market demand conditions nor real costs of production are decisive factors in typical nonmarket economies. Consequently, our antidumping laws contain a special provision for judging whether or not imports from a nonmarket economy are being "dumped." Section 205(c) of the Antidumping Act of 1921—now section 773(c)—permits the Secretary of the Treasury to use the prices charged in a free-market economy—as the foreign market value in comparing the foreign producer's price in the United States.

It is unfortunate that the executive branch has in the past used this provision to play politics with the Anti-

dumping Act—the Poland golf car case is a classic example.

When the domestic golf cart industry charged Poland with “dumping,” the administration, after shopping the entire world, could not find any other golf car producer that charged less than the Polish manufacturer—or a U.S. producer—was charging in the United States. Thus, it constructed a hypothetical price, based on what it would cost a Polish golf car producer to make a Polish golf car in Spain, where no golf cars are produced. This unusual procedure was instituted to enable the administration to decide the dumping case in favor of the Poles, and thus fulfill a commitment apparently given to the Polish Government during President Carter's December 1977 visit.

The second remedy now available to a domestic industry faced with an influx of imports from nonmarket economies is contained in section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974. Under this provision, an American industry need only prove to the International Trade Commission that it has been caused a certain amount of injury in order to justify the imposition of relief, which could be in the form of quotas, higher tariff rates, or a combination of the two. The catch here is that the law permits the President to disapprove, for whatever reasons, the imposition of any of the relief ordered by the Commission.

Thus, once again, as with dumping from nonmarket economies, the American manufacturer is subjected to having its legally authorized relief depend on foreign policy considerations which are totally extraneous to the manufacturer's market situation.

This bill is aimed at correcting the distortions which have been made of the remedies set out in our trade laws which were specifically implemented to protect our domestic markets from injury.

However, this bill is not a protectionist measure. It is simply an attempt to allow U.S. companies to prove dumping or injury by adopting a test which requires nonmarket economies to sell its products at a price which is the lowest price charged in a free-market economy or sent to the country from a free-market economy. The bill attempts to balance the concern of consumers for lower prices with a fair deal for domestic industries.

I am hopeful that our Trade Subcommittee can schedule hearings on this measure at an early time so that we can address this deficiency in our trade laws, and make the necessary changes before the normalization of trade with the People's Republic of China places our domestic industries under a pressure which may be too great for them to bear.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert a section-by-section anal-

ysis of my bill which I believe will provide my colleagues with a precise understanding of the legislation, and the inadequacies in our domestic law which it attempts to correct.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

This bill amends the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Trade Act of 1974 to provide a more coherent and easily administered body of trade law concerning imports from countries that do not have free-market economies.

SECTION 1

Section 1 of the bill amends subsection (c) of section 773 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which specifies the methods for determining foreign market value when non-market economies are accused of dumping.

The term “non-market economy country” would replace the term “State-controlled economy.” This change would bring subsection 773(c) into line with the bill's amendment to section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974; section 406 is amended by replacing “Communist country” with “non-market economy country.” Both subsection 773(c) and section 406 are concerned with the same countries and the same problem of non-market pricing; using the same terminology clarifies their interrelationship.

Section 1 would also amend section 773(c) to make it clear that the foreign market value of goods from non-market economy countries should be determined by examining the prices or costs of the most comparable free-market producer or producers, i.e., the producers that are located in a free-market economy country, including but not limited to the United States, and that are most nearly comparable to the non-market economy producer in size, sophistication, and technology. Although it was the Treasury Department's practice at the time subsection 773(c) was first enacted to compute the foreign market value of non-market imports by looking to prices or costs in third countries with comparable producers, that policy has since been changed in favor of seeking out the most comparable country. This change has not been a success. Trying to measure the “comparability” of market and non-market countries is virtually impossible; in practice, the new policy confers undue discretion upon administrators and contributes to great uncertainty about what our trade laws require. This amendment would correct the problem.

SECTION 2

Section 2 of the bill amends section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974. At present, section 406 authorizes the International Trade Commission (“the Commission”) to recommend relief whenever it determines that products of a Communist country are causing market disruption with respect to an article produced by a domestic industry. As now written, section 406 recognizes only one form of market disruption—a rapid surge in imports constituting a significant cause of material injury, or threat thereof, to a domestic industry. Because there is nothing unfair about importers' increasing their market share in open competition, section 406 as now written offers only temporary relief to U.S. industries, and even that relief is subject to modification by the President. It is true that non-market economies are especially prone to volume surges and other erratic supply patterns, but they also pose a special danger of unfair pricing, because non-market enterprises need not operate at a profit if they serve other goals, such as

bringing in hard Western currency. The proposed amendment would broaden the definition of market disruption to include artificial pricing.

Subsection 2(a). This subsection would strike out the term “Communist country” and replace it with the term “non-market economy country.” Because the primary focus of this bill is on a country's economic structure and not its politics, using an economic rather than a political term seems appropriate.

This subsection also recognizes the danger that non-market countries will engage in below-cost pricing by permitting the Commission to find market disruption caused by increased imports or artificial pricing or both.

Subsection 2(b). This subsection establishes a special procedure for modifying the relief recommended by the Commission. If the Commission recommends relief for market disruption caused by artificial pricing, the President may report that he intends to take action differing from the recommendation. His modification may be put into effect if within 90 days Congress adopts a concurrent resolution approving it. Thus a domestic industry that has proven its case to the Commission may be denied relief by Congress and the President. This is because relief under section 406 will sometimes implicate large issues of foreign policy, and supervision by elected officials serves as a safety valve for the exceptional case in which overriding national interest justifies disregarding a proven injury to U.S. industry.

Nonetheless, artificial pricing is an unfair international trade practice, akin to dumping or subsidizing exports. Neither dumping nor subsidy (countervailing duty) cases are subject to a Presidential override. Non-market countries should not escape the consequences of engaging in unfair artificial pricing unless the President and Congress agree that an exception is necessary. By placing the burden of persuasion on the President, the bill ensures that exceptions will be recommended by the Executive only in a small number of genuinely important cases.

This subsection also proposes other procedural changes in section 406; the changes are necessitated by the nature of the artificial-pricing problem. For example, the relief regarded by the Commission would not be subject to subsections (d), (h) or (j) of section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Subsection 203(d) is inapplicable because it prohibits increasing the rate of duty to (or imposing) a rate which is more than 50 percent ad valorem above the rate (if any) existing at the time of the proclamation. But if the Commission is to have the power to impose duties sufficient to eliminate artificial pricing, it must have the power to impose substantial specific duties on products that ordinarily have no ad valorem duty or no duty at all. Because nonmarket economies control the price of their goods, the declared value is subject to manipulation, so that any relief awarded by the Commission could easily be defeated if an ad valorem limitation applied. And, of course, it would be entirely appropriate to impose duties on artificially priced goods even though the goods ordinarily enter duty-free.

Subsection 203(h) provides that relief shall terminate 5 years after the day it takes effect and recommends that relief be reduced gradually over this period. While this may be a valid rule of thumb when imports have increased substantially but no

unfair practice has been shown, artificial pricing is an intentional breach of the rules of international trade. If the danger of further violations continues, so should the relief. Therefore, the new bill states that relief for artificial pricing may be granted or extended for more than 5 years, but only if the danger of such disruption is likely to continue for more than five years.

Subsection 203(j) is equally inapplicable. It provides that no investigation shall be made with respect to an article which has received relief under section 201 (or section 406) unless two years have elapsed since the last day on which import relief was provided with respect to such articles. Again, requiring a domestic industry to wait two years before renewing its claim for relief seems sensible with respect to a provision offering only temporary refuge from surging imports, but the requirement is out of place in a provision dealing with an unfair practice like artificial pricing. The bill provides instead that the granting of relief for market disruption caused by artificial pricing shall not operate to prevent the initiation of an investigation based on allegations that circumstances have changed since the end of the investigation leading to relief. Without a provision of this nature, non-market countries could continue to maintain an artificial advantage by dropping their prices even further once duties have been imposed under section 406. The provision is also necessary to permit a showing that inflation, or some other recent development, requires adjustment in the relief granted by the Commission.

Subsection 2(c). At present, section 406(c) permits the President to request a Commission investigation and to take emergency action with respect to market disruption caused by increased imports. The bill would permit him to do the same with respect to market disruption caused by artificial pricing.

Similarly, 406(d) now permits the President to initiate international consultations if he determines that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a country's increased imports are causing market disruption. This subsection would permit him to take the same action with respect to disruption caused by artificial pricing.

Subsection 2(d). The definitions contained in this section are the heart of the bill.

At present, section 406 applies only to countries "dominated or controlled by Communism." While this definition has the virtue of indisputably identifying the most obvious non-market economies, it does not deal with the economic nature of the problem. Accordingly, the bill supplements this definition by adding an economic concept drawn from the antidumping laws, specifically section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930. A non-market economy country is defined as a country whose economy is controlled to an extent that sales or offers of sales of merchandise in that country or to countries (including any country dominated or controlled by Communism) other than the United States do not reflect the true market value of the merchandise.

The subsection also makes several improvements in the existing definition of

market disruption caused by increased imports. Under the proposed amendment, such disruption would be held to exist within a domestic industry whenever direct or indirect imports of articles, like an article produced by such domestic industry, are increasing, either absolutely or relatively, so as to be, either alone or in combination with imports from other non-market economy countries, a cause of material injury, or threat thereof, to such domestic industry or a cause of material retardation of the establishment or a domestic industry. This definition takes into account the possibility that an increased volume of indirect imports from non-market countries will cause injury. The current test for comparable articles has been streamlined by dropping the phrase "or directly competitive with" in favor of defining "like article" in a manner parallel to the definition used in antidumping and countervailing duty cases (section 771(10) of the Tariff Act of 1930). A like article is defined as an article which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with an article subject to an investigation under this section.

The bill deletes the requirement in section 406 that imports be increasing "rapidly." This resolves a discrepancy between section 406 and the other provision for relief against increasing imports, section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974. The amendment also provides for cumulation of all non-market economy imports in determining the cause and extent of injury. This is because many non-market countries are part of a single, close knit economic community, so that coordinated export policies are a likelihood. The bill would also delete the requirements that nonmarket imports be a "significant" cause of material injury; it adopts instead the standard of the antidumping and countervailing duty laws which require that the challenged imports be a cause of material injury. See Tariff Act of 1930, sections 701 and 731. The bill also borrows from these laws the rule that relief may be awarded when the challenged imports are a cause of material retardation of the establishment of a domestic industry.

As has been explained, the bill adds a provision to section 406 permitting relief for market disruption caused by artificial pricing. It is similar in many details to the definition of disruption by increased volume discussed above. Because artificial pricing is so similar to other unfair trade practices, such as dumping and export subsidies, it is especially important to make the rules and remedies parallel in all three areas. Market disruption by artificial pricing is held to exist within domestic industry whenever an article, like an article produced by such domestic industry, is imported directly or indirectly from a non-market economy country or countries at a price below the lowest free-market price of like articles, so as to be, either alone or in combination with imports from other non-market economy countries, the cause of material injury, or threat thereof, to such domestic industry or a cause of material retardation of the establishment of a domestic industry.

The key to the new provision is the rule that non-market imports should not be

priced below the "lowest free-market price of like articles." This price is defined as the lowest average price, adjusted for differences in quantity, level of trade, duties or other factors required to insure comparability, charged for like articles in this country by either: (a) a producer from an appropriate free market country, including the United States, if that producer provides more than 5 percent of the apparent United States consumption of like articles; or (b) the aggregate of all producers from any appropriate free-market country, including the United States, that supplies more than 5 percent of the apparent United States consumption of like articles.

In essence, this definition permits non-market producers to charge the lowest price offered by any significant individual supplier or by all suppliers from any country responsible for a significant portion of domestic consumption. The five-percent requirement is designed to exclude anomalous producers or countries, whose prices may be affected by unusual circumstances (including ownership by a non-market enterprise). Ordinarily, the Commission can be expected to use the prices charged by an aggregate of producers from a single country in preference to the prices of a single producer. Using an aggregate price forestalls serious confidentiality problems and is generally more appropriate; the output of an entire non-market country should ordinarily be compared to the output of another entire country and not to that of a single firm. Nonetheless, the bill gives the Commission discretion to administer the new provision in a flexible manner consistent with the bill's intent. For example, the Commission may adjust prices to reflect differences in quantity, level of trade, duties, and other factors necessary to assure comparability. It may determine the prices of importers from a particular country by conducting a sample. Generally, the principles established in the countervailing duty and antidumping laws will assist the Commission in administering the new law.

In order to avoid the choice of an inappropriate country for purposes of comparison, the bill forbids comparison to goods from other non-market economy countries or to articles that are subject to countervailing duty or antidumping determinations.

Finally, the bill defines domestic industry as any industry producing an article in whole or in part in the United States, including any territory or possession of the United States. Watch producers in the Virgin Islands and Guam have already been hard-hit by the importation of watch subassemblies from the Soviet Union at extremely low prices. If the Soviet Union is granted MFN status and if it begins to import watches directly at artificial prices, a major portion of the insular possessions' economy could be wiped out. This provision would make it clear that section 406, as amended, protects the workers and industries of American possessions as vigilantly as it protects labor and business elsewhere in the United States. ●